Fourth Series, Vol.II, No.

Saturday, April 8, 1967
Chaitra 18, 1889 (Saka)

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(First Session)

4(7) 3
12 82

(Vol. II contains Nos. 1 to 10)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI
Price : Rs. 2. 00

LOK SABHA

Saturday, April 8, 1967/Chaitra 18, 1889 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at eleven of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

श्री यशपाल सिंह : श्रीमन्, हाथ जोड़ने का विधान नहीं है। हमारे विधान में हाथ जोड़ना नहीं है।

Shri Hem Barua: I am happy, Sir, that you fold your hands before you occupy your seat; we welcome it. I have been appreciating it from the very first day.

Shri Nath Pai: You are absolutely right, Sir. You are following your predecessor, Shri Anantasayanam Ayyangar, who always, in the true Indian tradition, used to do that.

श्री यशपाल सिंह : हमारे पार्लियामेंटरी विधान में नहीं है।

Mr. Speaker: Who says that? That is the right Indian method.

श्री कमल नयन बजाज : यह भारतीय तरीका है। इसे माना जाना चाहिये। आपको तो इसको मानना चाहिये।

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Abandoning of Coal Mines in Giridih Collieries

+

S.N.Q. 9. **Shri Bhogendra Jha:**
Shri Indrajit Gupta:
Shri Kamla Misra Madhukar:
Shri J. M. Biswas:
Shri Chandra Shekhar Sigh:
Shri S. A. Dange:
Shri S. M. Banerjee:
Shri Yogendra Sharma:
Shri Jagannath Rao Joshi:
Shri Bibhuti Mishra:

Will the Minister of Steel, Mines and Metals be pleased to state:

(a) whether the National Coal Development Corporation has decided to abandon mines in the Giridih Collieries of Bihar which will result in the retrenchment of three thousand labourers; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to change the decision of the National Coal Development Corporation?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Steel, Mines and Metals (Shri P. C. Sethi): (a) No, Sir. It has not been decided to abandon the Giridih collieries altogether. According to the approved programme of progressive closure of Giridih mines the Central pit is proposed to be closed by July, 1967 due to exhaustion of reserves. This will leave four working pits|inclines. Closure of the Central pit is likely to involve a retrenchment of 1148 labourers and 201 substitutes.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: Is it a fact that some new mines are also going to be closed and due to that, retrenchment, compensation will have to be paid to about 35 lakh workers and that in closing those mines a capital investment of about Rs. 25 lakhs to Rs. 30 lakhs will be wasted?

Shri P. C. Sethi: As a matter of fact, these mines are very old mines and since 1956-57, each year, on an average, we have been losing from Rs. 40 lakhs to Rs. 50 lakhs. Moreover, the inclines which are being closed are now short of coking coal, and therefore, it was decided to progressively close those pits, where the results are absolutely not found now. We are trying to give alternative employment to all persons who are retrenched; moreover, there is a scheme

of voluntary retirement; thereby we give them gratuity and other allowances.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: I did not get the answer to the second part of my question: whether the capital investment of about Rs. 25 lakhs to Rs. 30 lakhs will be wasted. Also, the mines, namely, 17B, 21 and Kolimaran mines are new mines and they are not old mines; nor are their stocks exhausted.

Shri P. C. Sethi: I have said in reply to the original question that we are not closing the mines altogether. We would be working four pits; we are only closing the central pit where the stocks have been completely exhausted. The other four inclines will be continued to be worked and accordingly till the time we get coal from them we will continue to work them.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: I have named the mines.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: From the latest annual report of the NCDC which has been supplied to us, I find it stated that the reduction in the total number of employees has been from 73,000 on 31-3-1964 to 68,500 on 31-3-1965, and to 65,600 on 31-3-66, *i.e.* an overall reduction of 7400 in two years. It seems the crisis is sought to be solved by largescale reduction in the labour force. In view of the fact that NCDC has got on hand very important further development projects with foreign co'laboration—Russian and Polish collaboration—may I know why the workers are being retrenched on this big scale instead of being absorbed or transferred to these new projects and thus adding to the already existing misery and starvation in Bihar?

Shri P. C. Sethi: This particular question relates to Giridih mines. As far as Giridih mines are concerned, we are trying to absorb and give alternative employment to the retrenched workers. Last year out of 623 workers who were surplus, 265 were adjusted in the voluntary retirement scheme and 100 persons were transferred to other projects. According to the availability of alternative sources of employment, we are trying to give them employment.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Not far from Giridih is Ramgarh where new projects are coming up. What is the difficulty in absorbing them there?

Shri P. C. Sethi: I have already stated that as and when employment avenues are available elsewhere, we would certainly try to help them.

श्री कमला मिश्र मधुकर : इस समय विहार में अकाल की स्थिति है। वहां महंगाई भी बहुत ज्यादा है। ऐसी स्थिति में छंटनी होने वाले मजदूरों के लिये महंगाई भत्ता देने के बारे में सरकार क्या कुछ सोच रही है या उनके जीवन निर्वाह के उपाय कर रही है ?

श्री प्र० चं० सेठी : अकाल के बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है। अकाल की स्थिति का जहां तक संबंध है वह बात ठीक है। लेकिन हम कोई हार्डशिप नहीं कर रहे हैं। जब वहां कोयला ही नहीं तो उनमें पब्लिक एक्सचैकर का, टैक्स पेयर्ज का मनी हम कैसे खर्च करते जा सकते हैं।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: From the statement it appears that nearly 1100 and odd workers are likely to be retrenched, though he does not agree that the mine is being closed. May I know what arrangements have been made to have a common pool of workers who are likely to be retrenched and absorbing them in other mines under the NCDC?

Shri P. C. Sethi: The NCDC as such is one company. Wherever we can give them alternative employment under NCDC, we will certainly try to help them. But I should make

it clear that there is a general recession in coal demand. Besides coking coal, in non-coking coal areas, we have to go slow about production. Keeping all these things in view, we would try to help them as far as we can.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We want to know whether there is a common pool where these workers who are likely to be retrenched will be given alternative jobs and, if so, whether jobs have been offered to these 1100 and odd workers and others? He is evading the question, Sir.

The Minister of Steel, Mines and Metals (Dr. Chenna Reddy): For all practical purposes, all these employees form a pool. Before we employ any new people for new work, the old workers will always be given priority.

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : माननीय मंत्री जी ने जो प्रश्न था उसका स्पष्ट उत्तर नहीं दिया है। जो नई खानें हैं जिनका नम्बर 17 वी है, 21 है और कोलिमारन है ये नई खानें हैं, इसलिये इन खानों के सिलसिले में कोयले के खत्म हो जाने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता है। फिर इनको क्यों बन्द किया जा रहा है? आपने कहा है कि खानों को वहां बन्द किया जा रहा है इसलिये कि कोयले का स्टाक एग्जास्ट हो गया है। लेकिन ये तो नई खानें हैं। इनमें कोयले के स्टाक के एग्जास्ट होने का सवाल नहीं है। फिर क्यों इनको बन्द किया जा रहा है। इनको बन्द करने से अढ़ाई लाख टन कोयले के उत्पादन में कमी होगी, कोयले के उत्पादन का खर्चा बढ़ जायेगा, मजदूरों में बेकारी बढ़ जायेगी। और यह सब उस हालत में जबकि बिहार में व्यापक गहरा अकाल फैला हुआ है। एन० सी० डी० सी० के हित में ऐसा करना नहीं है, मजदूरों के हित में नहीं है, कोयले के उत्पादन के हित में नहीं है। जब तमाम हितों के खिलाफ इन खानों को बन्द करना है तो फिर क्यों ऐसी चीज हो रही है? मैं चाहता हूं कि मंत्री महोदय इसका स्पष्ट उत्तर दें।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : मैंने यह नहीं कहा है कि तमाम खानें बन्द की जा रही हैं। मैंने केवल यह कहा है कि सेंट्रल पिट . . .

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सवाल बिल्कुल स्पेसिफिक है। मैंने 17बी, 21 और कोलिमारन खानों के बारे में सवाल पूछा है, जबकि मंत्री महोदय कुछ और ही कह रहे हैं।

Mr. Speaker: You must also hear him. Wait for the answer.

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : जैसा कि मैंने मूल उत्तर में कहा है, केवल सेंट्रल पिट को जुलाई, 1967 तक बन्द करने का निर्णय किया गया है। जहां तक उत्पादन का सवाल है, दस हजार टन से लेकर बारह हजार टन तक कोकिंग कोल . . .

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने केवल तीन खानों के बारे में सवाल किया है, लेकिन मंत्री महोदय उस के बारे में कुछ नहीं कह रहे हैं और दूसरी बातें कह रहे हैं। इस तरह सवाल-जवाब तो नहीं हो सकता है। सवाल कुछ है और जवाब कुछ है। यदि मंत्री महोदय को मेरे सवाल के बारे में जानकारी नहीं है, तो वह टाइम मांग लें। वह इन तीन खानों के बारे में दरयाफ्त करें। नई खानों को क्यों बन्द किया जा रहा है?

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मूल सवाल के उत्तर में मैंने निवेदन किया है कि केवल सेंट्रल पिट को बन्द किया जा रहा है। माननीय सदस्य जिन पर्टिकुलर नम्बर्ज का जिक्र कर रहे हैं, उन के बारे में जानकारी मेरे पास नहीं है।

श्री योगेन्द्र शर्मा : मंत्री महोदय पहले ही यह कह देते तो अच्छा रहता।

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : अगर वह इन नम्बर्ज के बारे में जानकारी चाहते हैं, तो मैं अगले सत्र में देने की कोशिश करूंगा। लेकिन मैं यह बता दूं कि सेंट्रल पिट के अलावा चार

इम्प्लाइन्ज और हैं—उन के नम्बर मेरे पास नहीं हैं,— जिन को हम चालू रखेंगे। माननीय सदस्य ने कहा है कि वहां बहुत उत्पादन होता है। वास्तव में वहां इतना उत्पादन नहीं हो रहा है। वहां पर लगभग बारह हजार टन कोकिंग कोल और पांच, छः हजार इन्फीरियर ग्रेड का कोयला उत्पन्न हो रहा है।

Dr. I. Ahmad: As far as I know the central pit is proposed to be abandoned from July. But the whole mine and other areas are full of water. There has been no arrangement for dewatering. Therefore, other inclines will a'so be affected. The three new inclines, as the hon. Member referred to, have got good coal. But there is sufficient third-grade-coal which is being used in coking plants. Some of the thermal power stations at Barauni are purchasing their coal from private firms. Giridih colliery is not supplying them any coal. Previously Giridih colliery used to supply them coal.

Mr. Speaker: Put the question, why go into all the history?

Dr. I. Ahmad: May I know why supply from Giridih colliery to Barauni power station has been stopped? May I also know why a small thermal power station cannot be built up at the Giridih colliery because there is third-grade coal, there are water and housing arrangements and this can be taken up?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: That is for the State Government concerned to come forward with any scheme for thermal power, and then *this* coal can certainly be utilised.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : सरकार की ओर से कहा गया है कि जो मजदूर छंटनी में निकाले जायेंगे, उनको दूसरी जगह काम देने की कोशिश की जायेगी, लेकिन यह 'कोशिश करना' तो कोई स्पष्ट आश्वासन नहीं है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि जब इतने बड़े पैमाने पर छंटनी होने जा रही है, तो क्या इस संबंध में कोई स्पष्ट प्रोसीजर बनाया गया है या नहीं। जैसा कि श्री बनर्जी ने प्रश्न किया है, क्या इन मजदूरों का कोई एक पूल बनाया जायेगा, जिस के अन्तर्गत जहां मजदूर ज्यादा हैं, वहां से उनको निकालने से पहले एक योजना बना कर ऐसी जगह डालने की कोशिश की जाये, जहां मजदूर कम हैं ?

डा० चेन्ना रेड्डी : जैसा कि मैंने अभी अर्ज किया है, वहां पर जैसे ही नया काम शुरू होगा, तो उस में निकाले जाने वाले पुराने मजदूरों को लिया जायेगा। हालांकि पूल के नाम से कोई व्यवस्था नहीं की गई है, लेकिन पुराने काम करने वालों को पहले लिया जायेगा।

श्री के० एन० तिवारी : मंत्री महोदय ने प्रश्न का उत्तर देते हुये कहा है कि कोयले का स्टाक बहुत ज्यादा हो गया है और वह उठ नहीं रहा है, वह भी बेकारी का एक कारण है। आज स्थिति यह है कि देहात में ईंटें वगैरह पकाने के लिये कोयला मिल नहीं रहा है। क्या गवर्नमेंट उस पर से रोक, कन्ट्रोल उठायेगी ताकि कोयला सब जगह मिल सके, लोगों की असुविधा दूर हो सके, और मजदूरी भी मिल सके ?

डा० चेन्ना रेड्डी : देहात में कोयले का इस्तेमाल बहुत ही कम पैमाने पर है। अगर वहां पर इस बारे में कुछ दुश्वारियां हैं, तो हम उनको जरूर दूर करेंगे। लेकिन कनजम्शन की मेन कमी इंडस्ट्रीज और रेलवेज की वजह से है।

Dr. Ranen Sen: Last year I had been to Giridih and I myself visited that particular colliery which is being closed. I learnt from the workers that the alternative employment that the surplus workers are being offered is that they are asked to go to Madhya Pradesh or

Andhra to work in the collieries there. Most of them are local labourers who are not prepared to go so far away for their employment. At the same time, I was told by the management itself that some new collieries are being opened nearby. So, instead of recruiting new labourers why does the Government not employ these workers in the new collieries which are being opened? Instead of forcefully retrenching them in the name of voluntary retirement, why could the Government not employ them in the nearby collieries which are being opened under the new projects?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: If in the neighbourhood there are new openings made, obviously the local workers will be given preference there. It is only when it becomes inevitable that they are asked to go to some other States. It is not out of any particular policy matter that they are sent to other areas.

Shri D. C. Sharma: The hon. Minister spoke of voluntary retirement. It is very strange that the term 'voluntary retirement' is being used in the case of wage-earners. Even assuming that you offer them voluntary retirement, what are the terms of the voluntary retirement? How do you ensure that it is voluntary? I am asking this question because in many cases what is termed as 'voluntary' is really 'compulsory'.

Dr. Chenna Reddy: This is a scheme introduced under the name of Voluntary Retirement Scheme. Under this the workers who have not crossed the age of 57 years are paid an amount as gratuity equivalent to the amount which they would have been paid had they been retrenched under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act. This is only to facilitate the retrenchment of workers with the co-operation of the workers and the unions instead of just forcing it under the law.

Shri Dattatraya Kunte: Is it the positive policy of the Government not to employ new labourers till the old retrenched labourers are accommodated and employed?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: It is not a positive rigid policy. Wherever old employees could be utilized, we will certainly give them preference. There is no rigidity about it.

श्री रामसेवक यादव : मंत्री महोदय ने अपने उत्तर मे दो बातें कही हैं : एक तो यह कि जितना कोयला हमारे पास है उतनी कोयले की आवश्यकता नहीं है और दूसरे उन खानों को चलाने में नुकसान होता है। इस देश में हमारा तजुर्बा यह रहा है कि कभी कोयले की कमी हो जाती है और कभी वह बढ़ जाता है। जिस का कारण यह है कि सरकार की कोई योजना नहीं है। कोयले की कमी है विशेषकर उत्तर प्रदेश में और कोयला काले बाजार में जाकर बिकता है। इन सब बातों को दृष्टि में रखते हुये क्या वहां के ट्रेड यूनियन वर्कर्ज के इस सुझाव को कार्यान्वित किया जायेगा कि उनको उन खानों को चलाने का मौका दिया जाये?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: As far as coal utilisation is concerned, the target of the Third Five Year Plan was of the order of 96 million tonnes while what we were able to achieve was only 68 million tonnes. This small difficulty that the hon. Member is pointing out is a matter which can easily be looked into and adjusted, but the huge deficiency is for various other reasons.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया है कि जिन मजदूरों को काम से हटाया जायगा उन्हें काम होने पर दूसरा काम दिया जायगा। काम होने पर तो जब तक उन्हें काम नहीं मिलता है तब तक क्या सरकार उन लोगों को कोई विशेष आर्थिक सहायता देने संबंधी बात पर विचार कर रही है ताकि वे इस महंगाई के जमाने में

अपने बाल बच्चों की हिफाजत कर सकें और अपने को बचा सकें ?

श्री चेन्ना रड्डी : आम तौर पर अगर किसी के काम की जरूरत नहीं है, मजबूरी है, उसको नहीं रख सकते तो उस को और काम दिलाने की कोशिश करते हैं और वालन्ट्री रिटायरमेंट में ग्रेच्युइटी वगैरह देकर उसको सहूलियत पैदा की जाती है।

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : विशेष तरीके की कोई सहायता आप देना चाहते हैं या नहीं इसका आपने कोई जवाब नहीं दिया।

Mr. Speaker: For which part did you not get the reply? Please repeat that part of the question.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : मैंने यह कहा कि उन मजदूरों को जब तक काम नहीं मिलता है तब तक कोई स्पेशल एकोनामिक असिस्टेंस देने की बात सोच रहे हैं ?

श्री चेन्ना रेड्डी : इस प्रकार सारे वर्कर्स को देने का सवाल तो बहुत मुश्किल है। जिन को वालन्ट्री रिटायरमेंट के तहत ग्रेच्युइटी मिल सकती है उनको देकर सहूलियत पैदा की जाती है।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में और नार्थ बिहार में बुकिंग के रेस्ट्रिकशन के कारण बराबर कोयले का शार्टेज रूरल एरिया में रहता है। कुछ दिन पहले एक स्कीम थी। रेलवे के लीन सीजन में उन जगहों पर स्टाक डम्प किया जाता था और जब जरूरत पड़ती थी तो लोगों को कोयला मिलता था। तो क्या फिर इस तरीके से कोयले को पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में और नार्थ बिहार में रेलवे के लीन सीजन में स्टाक करके खानों का भार हल्का करेंगे जिससे मजदूरों को काम भी मिलेगा और माइन्स का काम भी चलेगा ?

श्री चेन्ना रेड्डी : अगर सिर्फ मूवमेंट की वजह से कोई तकलीफ है तो उसकी तो हम बराबर जांच पड़ताल करते हैं और आनरेबिल मेम्बर कोई तफसील मेरे पास भेजें तो मैं जरूर जांच करूंगा।

श्री कामेश्वर सिंह : क्या यह सही है कि कोयले की खानों में पर्याप्त कोयला होने पर भी एन० सी० डी० सी० के कार्य को बन्द किया जा रहा है ?

श्री पी० सी० सेठी : इसका उत्तर दिया कि सेंट्रल पिट में पर्याप्त कोयला नहीं है इसीलिये इसको बन्द किया जा रहा है।

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: What is the difference between normal retirement and voluntary retirement? If there is greater inducement for voluntary retirement, will such a voluntarily retired person also be considered for a priority job if elsewhere jobs are found or is it that he is retired completely?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: In this voluntary retirement scheme there is one more point, namely, we want to avoid that the last man to join should be the first to go because new workers that have joined stand retrenched automatically; to avoid that we wanted to give advantage to those people who are below 57 years. They can get some gratuity which will be a considerable amount in view of the long duration of work that they have done.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj: What is the difference between normal retirement and is there any further inducement for voluntary retirement? That was my question.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Jyotirmoy Basu.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: Since there is an all-time record pithead accumulation, since we have invested a lot of money in the NCDC which is

running at a loss and since the diesel engine produced in India is 75 per cent foreign in its cost structure, have you at any time thought of pressing upon the Railway Ministry not to switch over to diesel?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: It is a very important and practical approach; in fact, this was the point which I very recently discussed with the Coal Commissioner. It is now engaging our attention and we are working out the details. Later on, if we find that we have sufficient grounds, we will take it up with the Railways.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: But they have reduced it by 1 million tonnes already. What are you doing?

Mr. Speaker: Shri Shiv Chandika.

श्री शिव चण्डिका : क्या मंत्री महोदय यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि यह जो छटनी होने वाली है वह रेकग्नाइज्ड यूनियन और मालिक के बीच में समझौता होने के बाद होगी ?

Dr. Chenna Reddy: Retrenchment is done with the agreement or, at any rate, it will be discussed with the recognised union. It will be done—as much as it is inevitable—with the normal procedure. Certain procedure is there and that will be done only after that.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : कोयला खानों में हजारों मजदूर ऐसे हैं जो ठेके पर काम करते हैं। उन्हें ठेका पर काम चरने के लिये लाया जाता है और उन की रोजाना की तनखा सवा दो रुपये होती है लेकिन उनसे सवा दो रुपये पर हस्ताक्षर कराया जाता है और केवल 1 रुपया 2 आना दिया जाता है। ऐसी हजारों शिकायतें हैं तो क्या मंत्री महोदय इस की छानबीन करेंगे ?

श्री चेन्ना रेड्डी : ऐसे कोई स्पेसिफिक केस हों तो उस के बारे में छानबीन करेंगे।

Shri J. M. Biswas: Is the Minister aware that the NCDC coal is not normally accepted by the public sector industry, but that class of coal is accepted by them when the same comes through the contractor. Why is Government not making any arrangement to make the public sector accept compulsorily the NCDC coal?

Mr. Speaker: We are going outside the main question.

Shri J. M. Biswas: It is about consumption of coal. It is seen in the collieries, and the collieries are telling that the NCDC coal has no market.

Mr. Speaker: No, no.

Is he answering?

Shri P. C. Sethi: The question is about closure of Giridih mines.

Mr. Speaker: The whole coal is being questioned now. I cannot allow. (*Interruptions*).

Now call attention.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं . (व्यवधान) मंत्री जी ने जो उत्तर दिया . . . .

Shri S. M. Banerjee: On a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: He is rising on a point of order. If it was confined to Giridih mines, I could have allowed a few more questions. Now questions about the whole coal supply and all that are being asked. For one question, I have already allowed half an hour. It is not as if I have hustled through. (*Interruptions*).

Shri S. M. Joshi: You should protect us, Sir. I asked him a question whether he is going to make arrangements for that. Now he says that they do not make arrangements . . .

Mr. Speaker: How can I help it? If the answer is not satisfactory, naturally he must ask him again. How can I help it?

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : सवाल का जवाब पूरा नहीं दिया जाता है उसके लिए आप को प्रोटेक्शन देना चाहिये।

Mr. Speaker: I know that. He has given he answer. If the answer is not satisfactory, I cannot help it. (*Interruptions*).

श्री मधु लिमये : माफ कीजिए, पन्द्रह दिन की कार्यवाही उठाकर देखिए कितनी बार कहा गया है कि जवाब नहीं सही आ रहा है ।

Mr. Speaker: There is so much of shouting. Let one member speak at a time, so that I can hear.

Shri Jyotirmoy Basu: This is the only forum through which we can ventilate the grievances of millions of people whom we represent. If we are given evasive answers and deliberate falsehood is practised, we are helpless. The coal mine industry is being wrecked altogether. There is record stock; they cannot sell it and nothing has been done.

Mr. Speaker: There must be some relevancy to the question. We are discussing about closure of Giridih mines. Now ques'ions are asked about surplus coal, selling of coal, etc. Are these supplementaries to the main question? Can he ask such questions (*Interruptions*). There is no use arguing about that.

श्री एस० एम० जोशी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने जो सवाल पूछा वह इस के साथ बराबर ताल्लुक रखता है । जबकि हजारों आदमी बेकार किये जा रहे हैं, छंटनी होती है तो मेरा सवाल यह है कि इतना बड़ा आर्गेनाइजेशन जो इनका बना हुआ है, उसमें इन को ऐबजार्ब करने के लिये, आलटरनेट जाब देने के लिय कोई व्यवस्था है या नहीं और नहीं है तो करना चाहते हैं या नहीं ?

Mr. Speaker: I have myself heard it. The Minister can repeat it now.

The hon. Member wants to know whether there is any alternative scheme for the unemployed people in be absorbed. The hon. Minister has already answered it, but I shall ask him to repeat it.

Shri P. C. Sethi: The NCDC being the public sector employer, we shall see that wherever there is alternative employment available, preference is given to those who are being retrenched and no new worker is taken in. This is the assurance that has been given.

Shri S. M. Joshi: He has not answered my question. ये कहते हैं कि हमारी एक आर्गेनिजेशन है, उसको जब मौका मिलेगा तो डालेंगे । लेकिन हम यह कहते हैं कि आप ऐसा क्यों नहीं करते हैं कि कोई पूल बनायें और जो एक जगह सरप्लस हो, उसको दूसरी जगह एबजोर्ब कर लें, ऐसा क्यों नहीं किया जाता है ?

Mr. Speaker: He has answered it already. Now, we shall proceed to the next item.

11.30 hrs.

RE: CALLING-ATTENTION NOTICES AND SHORT-NOTICE QUESTIONS

(*Procedure*)

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Before you proceed to the calling-attention notice, I would like to raise a point of order. I was also a signatory to that. It is good that you, Sir, are trying to follow some of the better precedents and traditions of this House. For instance, you are greeting the House with *namaskar* every day. I welcome this.

I would like to point out to you the practice of your distinguished predecessor that on the last day of every session he was pleased to admit more than one short-notice question.

I had tabled a short-notice question. I have also written a letter to

you about it. It is on a matter of urgent public importance; it is on a burning topic of the day namely whether the Soviet Union and the USA have sent identical drafts of nuclear . . .

Mr. Speaker: I had got his question. I know that he has also written to me.

Shri Nath Pai: Kindly bear with me. If you do not allow me, I shall not try to impose it on you. But I am coming to the procedural matter. I am told that the External Affairs Minister casually and lakadaisically has rejected my question. They are running this country like a zamindari. We shall not allow Parliament to be treated like a zamindari estate. This is a very serious matter . . .

Mr. Speaker: May I request the hon. Member not to use such language?

Shri Nath Pai: What is the point in rejecting my short-notice question? Is he not called upon to give some explanation? Is this an ordinary matter?

Mr. Speaker: I have got the hon. Member's letter. As he knows, and as the House knows, short-notice questions are either accepted or not accepted by the hon. Minister.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगर) : लेकिन मैंने तो 40 दिये हैं, उनमें से एक को भी इन्होंने नहीं स्वीकारा है, आखिरकार कितनी मेहनत व्यर्थ जाती है।

Mr. Speaker: Shri Madhu Limaye should resume his seat. He is the leader of a party. When I am talking and when I am on my legs, he should not stand up and speak in this manner. Is that proper?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं तो सिर्फ इस तरफ आपका ध्यान दिला रहा हूं कि मैंने 40 दिये हैं।

Mr. Speaker: When I am explaining something and when I am talking and when am on my legs and I am in the middle of a sentence, I do not see why the hon. Member should—I would not say, shout, but—start pointing out something. I have heard Shri Nath Pai patiently when he said something. I have got his letter also here. But it is not as if I can force short-notice questions on the Ministers. There are certain sets of rules. I send the short-notice questions to the Ministers. If it were possible, as my predecessor used to do, in the evening we could take up one or two more. It is not the practice that when the hon. Minister rejects it we take it up here. When it is not provided for in the rules, how can we do it? I know that a number of amendments have been given notice of by hon. Members. When we consider those amendments perhaps hon. Members could make provision for this in the rule also. But today as the rules stand, I cannot force any Minister to simply say that he would accept it. If he is not prepared to answer it at short notice, under what rule can I force him? It is not within my powers. I cannot do it under the rules as they stand today.

Shri Nath Pai: Let me help you in this matter. My leader Shri Surendranath Dwivedy had given notice of a motion....

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): I had given notice of a question.

Shri Nath Pai: I had also written to you about it.

We do not want to appear to be bludgeoning you into doing something. We want to see that your authority prevails, and you must ensure that the authority of this House prevails against the executive. What Shri M. C. Chagla does it that he just takes shelter behind the rules. This is a vital matter. The draft has come. We are being bludgeoned into signing

[Shri Nath Pai]

something just like a colonial country, by the super-powers. He must not take advantage of some rule or take shelter under some rule. The Deputy Prime Minister is here and let him answer this. Here are two super-powers who are telling us 'You better sign the nuclear treaty'. By this evening Parliament will be adjourned and we would not have any occasion to express our views. We do not have confidence that these people will stand up and tell the USSR and the USA that 'No, we shall not barter away our sovereignty.'. This is a matter where you ought to have applied your mind and called Shri M. C. Chagla to the House. I think the House is justified in asking for an assurance. But instead I just get a lackadaisical reply that he is not pleased to accept this question. Is this bludgeoning you or seeking your co-operation in upholding your authority and the authority of the House? I think that you would agree with me.

Shri Hem Barua: I had written to you about it. I had submitted a calling-attention notice on the reported withdrawal of Indian diplomats from the Pakistani National Day celebrations in Peking. You did not give permission for that.

Mr. Speaker: That is a different matter.

Shri Hem Barua: Then, I had submitted a short-notice question on that. But Shri M. C. Chagla had refused to accept the short-notice question. Then, I wrote to you about it. Then, I have got information from your office basing the reply on the information that he had supplied to your office. Shri M. C. Chagla could very well have given a reply to my short-notice question, when it is such an important matter as the withdrawal of the Indian diplomats at the Peking celebrations.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should not raise these things in this manner.

Shri Hem Barua: I just want a clarification from you. Have you disallowed the calling-attention notice? The hon. Minister may have disallowed the short-notice question. But what about the calling-attention notice? If both are rejected and not allowed, then where is the opportunity for us to raise the matter? We are left in the lurch completely.

Mr. Speaker: The Rules Committee will be meeting and then we can make provision for these things. Hon. Members can bear all these in mind and discuss them in the Rules Committee. And whatever the rules provide, and whatever authorities hon. Members give to the House, to the Ministers and to the Chair, will be followed.

I would now ask Shri D. N. Patodia to read out his calling-attention notice.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): On a point of order....

Shri Nath Pai: Could the Deputy Prime Minister say something on this?

Shri Hem Barua: You can come down on the Ministers if you want to. You have got a good amount of strength and authority also.

Shri Nath Pai: We shall all be with you on this matter.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to raise a point of order under rule 376 (2), which says that a point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House....

Mr. Speaker: That is the general rule. On what issue is he raising the point of order?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: It is in connection with the business before the House at the moment; the business before the House at the moment is

the calling-attention-notice. My point of order relates to calling-attention-notices. About the calling-attention-notice also, there are certain rules laying down how they should be admitted, what the matter of urgent public importance should be and so on. What I would submit is that there was a practice in the House, a sort of good convention, I should say....

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be a point of order about conventions and all that. Actually, there is no point of order at all about any such thing. A point of order must be in relation to any subject that is before the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Calling-attention-notice is now before the House, and I am speaking on calling-attention-notices in general, not on this specific calling-attention-notice.

Mr. Speaker: This calling-attention notice relates to the Aid India Consortium. Has he any point of order in relation to that?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have read the calling-attention-notice. What I am submitting is that there is a convention that on the last day of a session, three or four calling-attention notices are admitted....

Mr. Speaker: What is the point that the hon. Member wants to raise?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Today is the last day of this session....

Mr. Speaker: I know. I have no objection, if hon. Members want more calling-attention-notices to be taken up. But where is the point of order in this?

Shri A. B. Vajpayee (Balrampur): It is only a submission.

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या आप विनती सुनेंगे। आप कहते हैं कि व्यवस्था नहीं है, इसलिये विनति करना चाहता हूं।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: My submission is this. On the last day of a session, three or four calling-attention-notices are admitted, and the first is answered orally while the replies to the othere are laid on the Table of the House. There are many important questions which we wanted to raise. But those are not admitted. Short-notice questions also are not admitted because that is within the discretion of the Ministers to admit or not to admit, because they have to accept before they can be admitted. Then, the calling-attention-notices were tabled; the question of admitting them rests entirely in your hands. Even yesterday, I had said something about a very serious situation which was going to develop when all the employees of the....

Mr. Speaker: In the name of a point of order, the hon. Member is going on to other subjects. A point of order which is raised must be in relation to some business which is before the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Calling-attention-notice is the business before the House. I am also raising a point in relation to calling-attention-notices...

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Member want to raise any point regarding the particular calling-attention-notice that is before us at the moment?

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You may allow us kindly to submit and express our views sometimes.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member may resume his seat. Suppose all the other Members also raise some point on some other subject like the Hon. Member, then where will it end? Can any work be done in this House if all the five hundred and odd Members start raising some point of order and some issue? I am not able to understand this. If every day this is going to happen, I do not know what can be done.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: How can we seek your guidance on this? We can only request you, if you have disallowed our calling-attention-notice....**

**Not recorded.

Mr. Speaker: This will not be recorded. Let the hon. Member go on raising whatever he likes. I shall have to offer satyagraha. What else can I do? After all, I am helpless. If every day this kind of thing happens, what am I to do?

Shri Hem Barua: Is it satyagraha on your part?

Shri N. Dandeker (Jamnagar): I move that we get on with the next item on the agenda.

Mr. Speaker: Calling Attention.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTTANCE

DECISION *re* AID TO INDIA BY AID INDIA CONSORTIUM

Shri D. N. Patodia (Jalore): I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon:

> "The decision taken by the Aid India Consortium at its meeting held in Paris about the quantum of Aid to be given to India in 1967-68."

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): There are four pages I hope there is no objection to reading it.

Mr. Speaker: I think it is important enough.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): He need not read. We will start asking supplementaries.

Shri Morarji Desai: It will take only ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Let him read.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, hon. Members are aware that for some years now a number of countries and institutions interested in development assistace to India have been meeting periodically under the Chairmanship of the World Bank to consider our needs for external assistance. These are Austria, Belgium, Canada, France West Germany, Italy, Japan the Netherlands, the U.K. and the U.S.A. meeting of what has come to be known as the Aid-India Consortium was held in Paris from April 4 to 6, to consider our needs for the year 1967-68. The World Bank has issued a Press Communique at the end of the meeting and a copy of the communique is laid on the Table of the House. [*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-322|67.]

2. There is very little that I can add to the communique itself. Hon. Members, however, would note that the communique shows that the countries and institutions represented at the Consortium have taken a friendly and constructive view of our requirements as usual. Although the full details of the assistance to be made available by each member of the Consortium have not yet been worked out, a target of approximately $ 1300 million for new aid to be provided in non-project form, inclusive of aid to meet our food requirements, has been considered appropriate. This year we have been faced with a particularly difficult situation in which we need to import substantial quantities of food in addition to the normal requirements of raw materials, components and the like for sustaining our agriculture and industry. It is gratifying that the communique is able to say that, together with adequate total non-project assistance, India's immediate requirements of food imports should be met without jeopardising other essential imports. Hon. Members, I am sure, would like me to take this opportunity of thanking the World Bank and the countries represented in Paris for their continued support to our developmental efforts.

3. On food, on present indications, we need to import during the current calendar year about 10 million tonnes of which imports of 4.3 million tonnes have already been arranged largely as a result of supplies authorised by the United States under the PL 480 Programme. Some other friendly countries, notably Canada, the Soviet Union and Australia, have also given us generous food assistance which forms a part of the imports already arranged. In addition, the United States Government has shown willingness to supply a further quantity of 3 million tonnes under the Food for Peace Pragramme if an appropriate response to our food needs is also found among our other friends. This leaves a balance of about 2.7 million tonnes. Against this balance, some 600,000 tonnes of a total offer of 700,000 tonnes from Canada would be available as they are yet to be shippind and, therefore, not included in the figure of 4.3 million tonnes to which I referred earlier. As the communique points out, new aid for food, fertilizers and related agricultural production materials as well as aid in a form which releases cash for the purchase of food was indicated by Consortium members during the meeting. Although no details are yet available of the contribution of individual countries or its nature, it is believed that total food aid from consortium countries other than United States and Canada will enable us to procure foodgrains worth $120 million. If some additional food assistance is available from countries and institutions not represented at the Consortium, this should make it possible to meet our immediate import requirements of food, subject, of course, to availability in world markets and the adequacy of total non-project assistance to take care of both our food and non-food requirements.

4. The requirements of additional food aid inclusive of the U.S. portion of 3 million tonnes, the balance of the Canadian offer yet to be shipped and the assistance promised or expected from other countries add upto $ 380 million. Since total non-project requirements, both food and non-food, have been estimated by the Consortium approximately at $1300 million, it follows that non-project assistance for requirements other than food has been placed at about $900 million i.e. the same level as in 1966-67 . While we shall have to wait for legislative and other formalities to be completed in the countries concerned before definite pledges covering this amount are made, it is resasonable to hope that pledges will be made expeditiously to enable us to continue to meet our priority requirements on an effective basis. Consortium members have also agreed that they would join us in a cooperative effort to ensure that a substantial portion of the new aid will be utilised quickly. We propose to explore in bilateral discussions with countries and institutions represented at the Consortium all possible ways of securing quicker utilisation of available aid by improvements in procedures and terms.

5. The communique does not refer to project aid. This does not mean that no project aid will be forthcoming from the Consortium countries during the current year. We are having bilateral discussions with a number of Consortium countries for securing aid for those projects which are ready to go forward and which we wish to carry forward in the light of our own needs and circumstances. Apart from this, there will undoubtedly, be further meetings of the Consortium during the current year at which it would be possible for us to have our requirements of project aid discussed, in general, to facilitate subsequent bilateral negotiations.

6. I would only add in conclusion that a forum like the Consortium represents a significant development in international cooperation. It cannot function effectively or profitably without the utmost goodwill and understanding among all its members whether they be recipients or

[Shri Morarji Desai]

donors. If the Aid-India Consortium which was the first Consortium of its kind has been able to sustain, despite ups and downs a constructive interest in Indian economic development among so many countries around the world for nearly nine years now, the credit for it goes largely to the world Bank authorities.

Shri D. N. Patodia: In the Budget Estimates for 1967-68, provision was made for foreign assistance to the extent of Rs. 835 crores, which will be equivalent to nearly 1,100 million dollars. Out of 900 million dollars, which is equivalent to Rs. 700 crores, for non-food items, nearly Rs. 340 crores will be utilised for repayment of loans and interest, leaving a small balance of only Rs. 360 crores to be spent in effective manner. Regarding project items there is no certainty about the availablity of loans, audit will depend upon further negotiations. Therefore how does the Government propose to revise their estimates in respect of foreign investments in view of such indication by the Aid India Consortium? Further, drawing attention to the further passage of the communique laying emphasis on measures to encourage private foreign investments in priority sectors and on efficiency in Indian industry in general, how does the Goverment propose to put into practice such assurances given by India to the Aid India Consortium?

Shri Morarji Desai: What assurrance is the hon. Member referring to?

Shri D. N. Patodia: In the communique it has been said that India has assured that proper incentives will be given to encourage private foreign investment in priority sectors and on efficiency in Indian industry in general.

Shri Morarji Desai: They ae what we have already declared and said in accordance with our policies.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah (Junagadh): In view of the continued reluctance....

Shri D. N. Patodia: What about the first question?

Shri Morarji Desai: If several questions are asked, I cannot remember.

Shri D. N. Patodia: How does he propose to revise their estimates in respect of foreign investments?

Shri Morarji Desai: We have got to make all legitimate efforts to do so.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: In view of the continued reluctance on the part of Consortium countries to decide on the project aid, may I know which projects would be delayed and for how long? May I also know whether any request, formal, or informal has been made by the Government of India to the consortium to reschedule the debt repayment and whether the Government would also consider and assist any debt repayment of loans to private sector projects?

As the consortium has decided to give food aid, will the hon. Deputy Prime Minister indicate as to how this will be financed.

Would the Government use such aid to countract inflationary presures by not sponding its rupee returns?

Shri Morarji Desai: Five questions are asked. I have no gigantic memory nor am I young as the hon. Member.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: Yesterday, the hon. Speaker said that one could ask.

Mr. Speaker: I said Mr. Hem Barua puts (a) (b) and (c).

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: If he so desires, I shall request each question separately.

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not mind. Whatever the Speaker allows, I shall answer; I am in his hands.

Shri Virendra Kumar Shah: My first question: In view of the continued reluctance on the part of consortium countries to decide on the project aid, may I know which projects would be delayed and for how long?

Shri Morarji Desai: The question puts the cart before the horse. Unless I know what the project aid is, how can I say which projects are going to be taken or how many are going to be taken. Negotiations have to be carried on and they will be carried on.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Speaker, before I proceed to put my question, I should like to have your guidance. I cannot compete with others in lung power but I rely upon arguments and reasons. I have once said—let me not be compelled to repeat it—that survival of the noisiest should not be the rule in the Lok Sabha.

Shri Hem Barua (Mangaldai): Do you agree?

Mr. Speaker: I do not agree; that is why he is on his legs.

Shri Nath Pai: First, I would like to draw your attention to the statement laid on the Table of the House by the Deputy Prime Minister. I have given my call attention notice to the Finance Minister. It is very likely that Mr. Desai has a preference for the title of the Deputy Prime Minister; otherwise....

Shri Morarji Desai: I will correct it immediately; let it be Finance Minister. I have no objection.

Shri Nath Pai: I welcome the forthrightness of his statement. But it raises some very grave apprehensions in our minds. I would like to draw your attention to page 4 where says: the Communique does not refer to project aid. Calculations have already been made by one hon. Member that if we take into consideration what will be allotted for food and add it to the servicing and repayment of loans, then very little is left for non-project aid. But let us leave that aside. Does it mean that the World Bank and the Consortium which used to under-write the Five Year Plans now chooses to write off the Fourth Plan and as a result of this we can assume safely that the Fourth Plan is more or less scuttled? How does the Government, in the second year of the Plan, propose in view of this communique to rescue and sustain the plan which is in the doldrums?

Shri Morarji Desai: In the first place, the fourth Five Year Plan is not finalised. In the second place, the World Bank is not bound to write off all our Plans or write up all our Plans or underwrite them—whatever terms you want to use. (*Interruption*). The question is, wha ever project aid we require, we negotiate with those countries with the help of the World Bank, and we are continuing to do that. It depends on what aid we get.

Shri Nath Pai: So, the Plan is in the doldrums, because you have no assurance on aid; your Plan depends on that aid; it is not forthcoming.

Shri Morarji Desai: I did not say that it is not forthcoming; When we find that it is not forthcoming, wo may say that it is like that; if it is forthcoming, then it will not be like that. All that I cannot say today— (*Interruption*).

Shri Nath Pai: So, the Plan is in ant, but is he really convincing to you, Sir? My question is very simple; here is a document; his own statement is forthright, and I have been generous enough to accept it. But then he is evasive; the Deputy Prime Minister of India, we feel should be a little more convincing and not be so evasive. (*Interruption*).

Shri Morarji Desai: Why do you say "Deputy Prime Minister?" (*Interruption*). Well, there is no ques-

[Shri Morarji Desai]

tion of evading anything. I would not like to do so. It must be seen from the statement that I have made that I have tried to explain the whole thing very frankly. In the matter of project aid, it does not depend only on what will come; it depends on our capacity to convince them, and if we can convince them we will get it. But it also depends upon other resources that we are able to mobilise here. If we are not able to mobilise them, we have to reconsider it. All these have to be considered, and I am not in a position to say today what will be mobilised. The hon. Members will have to wait for the budget which is forthcoming at the end of May.

Shri Nath Pai: Without saying so, he agrees that the fourth Plan is in the doldrums.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): I would like to have some information from the hon. Finance Minister regarding certain observations which appear in the communique of the consortium, which is also being attached to this statement. But his statement itself is silent on this point, and that is why I ask this question. In the communique of the consortium, there is a detailed reference to certain assurances or certain indications given to the consortium by the delegation representing the Government of India which was present during the course of the meeting, and it says that on the basis of those assurances and indications, the consortium was pleased to come to this decision. The hon. Minister just now admitted and everyone knows that the Plan has not being finalised yet; it has not been discussed and finalised in this House yet; before that finalisation is done may I know to what extent this delegation of officials was authorised to make the assurances to the consortium in respect of such basic matters as priorities of Planning; whether we are going to go in for more or for less industrialisation, whether we are going to divert all our resources of agriculture, whether we are going to give fresh incentives for foreign private investment and so on. All these are indicated here. What are these assurances which were given on the basis of which they have agreed to give food?

Shri Morarji Desai: The assurances are not for changing our priorities. Our priorities are that we have got to increase our agricultural production.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: At the cost of industry.

Shri Morarji Desai: There is *nothing* at the cost of each other. But food is the first problem; and we have to be self-sufficient in that. But if we are not self-sufficient immediately—that is also the feeling of many hon. Members here—it may not be of some others who perhaps want to cavil at us; I am not interested in that kind of thing—(*Interruption*).

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Self-sufficient by importing more!

Shri Morarji Desai: We want to stop it, that is why agriculture is important. (*Interruption*).

Shri Bhogendra Jha (Jainagar): Why are you charging honourable members with wanting to creak chaos? That is an insinuation.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Peermade): It has led to chaos. This Government is responsible for this chaos.

Shri Bhogendra Jha: He will pay for it.

Shri Morarji Desai: We will have to be patient.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us hear the Finance Minister.

Shri Morarji Desai: I can only say....

Shri Bhogendra Jha: You withdraw it; otherwise, you may be paid

back in the same coin and then you should not resent. (*Interruption*).

Shri Morarji Desai: Withdraw what? I am not going to withdraw anything.

12 hrs.

I wll say it with greater emphasis and stick to it.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Can a minister be irrelevant in his answer? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Morarji Desai: I am not going to submit to this kind ot thing. (*Interruptions*). The hon. members should not get annoyed if I meet them squarely. I do not maind them meeting me squarely. I do not understand why they get annoyed. This is not the method of parliamentary tactics. I do not mind their interrupting me. But they ought to hear with patience what I tell them. Afterwards, they can say what they like. In this matter, the assurances are only in accordance with the policies we have framed for ourselves. They relate to two things that we are going to prosecute our agricultural programmes even more efficiently than before and that in the matter of family planning also, the programmes will be taken ahead. There also, the assurances are only those which have been given so far by us. Nothing more is contemplated

12.02 hrs.

RE. SITUATION IN PUNJAB AND RAJASTHAN

Mr. Speaker: The Home Minister.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : मैं दो तीन बार खड़ा हुआ हूं । मेरा आप निवेदन सुन लें । आज आखिरी दिन है इसलिये आपके साथ कमरे में बैठ कर कुछ चीजों के बारे में बात करना सम्भव नहीं है । दो मैंने ध्यानाकर्षण के प्रस्ताव दिये थे । एक राजस्थान में लोकतंत्रीय सरकार के निर्माण के बारे में जिस पर सभी विरोधी दल . . . . .

Mr. Speaker: If I allow him, I will have to allow everybody.

Shri Randhir ingh (Rohtak): There is no Government in Punjab.

Shri Ram Kishan Gupta (Hissar): Constitution has failed there.

श्री मधु लिमये : 22 मई तक हम मिलें नहीं । आप सुनेंगे भी नहीं, फिर कहेंगे कि मैं चिल्लाता हूं

Mr. Speaker: Rajasthan is important, I agree. I also agree that Punjab is equally important. But we are in the midst of some business. The Home Minister will make a statement.

श्री मधु लिमये : 22 मई के पहले हम लोग यहां आने वाले नहीं हैं, इसलिये क्या गृह मंत्री राजस्थान की स्थिति पर कोई बयान करेंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: He says, Punjab first.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप उनकी बात भी सुन लें : मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूं । उनके बात भी सुन लें, आज आखिरी दिन है ।

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : पहले राजस्थान को लिया जाये ।

Mr. Speaker: I request all members to sit down. I entirely agree that Rajasthan is important and Punjab is equally important. If one raises one point, the other side also wants to raise something. You canno' give an oppounity to one group alone. One group alone cannot be treated as a privileged group.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्रिवलेज का क्या मतलब है । आप हमें नेता नेता कहते हैं, एक मिनट बात भी नहीं सुनेंगे ।

Mr. Speaker: If I hear everybody for one minute each, one hour will be spent on this.

श्री मधु लिमये : तो फिर मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

Mr. Speaker: There is no subject before us.

श्री मधु लिमये : कार्य सूची के बारे में है।

Mr. Speaker: How does it come now.

श्री मधु लिमये : आप मेरी बात सुन लीजिये। एक मिनट नहीं सुनेंगे ?

Mr. Speaker: This always happens. Naturally, when one begins to raise something, others also will begin to do the samething. There must be some method of raising these things. You have made the rules. You change them and say that any hon. Member can raise anything at any time. I have no objection. What does it matter to me whether the Home Minister makes a statement or the Finance Minister makes the statement.

श्री मधु लिमये: उनकी बात भी सुनने के लिये मैं आप से कह रहा हूं। उनकी ओर से भी बोल रहा हूं। पंजाब पर भी बहस हो।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Shri Berwa must sit down. I am on my legs. When I am on my legs nobody should start shouting. I am not prepared to hear anybody now. As I said, you may change the rules, I have no objection and I will abide by them. But there is absolutely nothing before the House.

श्री मधु लिमये : आपकी मदद कर रहे हैं कारंवाई में। मेरा निवेदन है कि गृह मंत्री राजस्थान की स्थिति पर ध्यान करें।

श्री राम किशन गुप्ता (हिसार): पहले पंजाब पर।

Mr. Speaker: In the name of point or order if you want to raise some subject here, everybody can do that. It is not the privilege of one hon. Member alone, everybody can do that. If we encourage that, then there will be no end to it and no work can be carried on here. In the name of point of order you want to bring in the subject of Rajasthan. Then others can bring in Madras, Bengal and every other State. In that case anybody can raise any subject at any time and talk on that.

श्री मधु लिमये : सब को एक एक मिनट सुन लीजिये।

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I cannot allow. that. How can I allow any hon. Member to raise a subject, in the name of point of order, which is not on the Agenda? Rajasthan has no reference to the Agenda for today If I allow Shri Limaye to raise it, how can I object to others raising their points?

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कहां मना कर रहा हूं। पहले उनकी बात को ही आप सुन लें।

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am trying to lay down a procedure. If in the name of point of order.... (*Interruptions*). Order, order. If I permit one to raise a point of order on any subject, then I will have to allow others also. I am not prepared to allow anybody to raise anything at any time. Why should one hon. Member alone have the privilege of raising something in the name of point of order? If I allow one hon. Member to do that, what right have I to prevent others from doing the samething.

श्री मधु लिमये : पन्द्रह साल से यह चला आ रहा है। हमेशा सुना जाता है। नई कौन सी बात चली है। आज आखिरी दिन है।

Mr. Speaker: If somebody does something wrong, I cannot allow the whole House to do it.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कह रहा हूं कि उनकी बात भी आप सुन लें। मैं कहां मना करता हूं ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. If I allow him I will not be able to stop others from doing it.

Shri Bhogendra Jha (Jainagar): Sir, my point of order is very relevant. I will not rise anything which is not to the point.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not prepared to hear anything now. Let us hear the hon. Minister of Home Affairs on the Privilege Motion.

12.08 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE RE: ARREST OF MEMBER

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Y. B. Chavan): Sir, yesterday, when this question of privilege was under consideration, you gave me some time to collect all the information. I asked the Chief Secretary, Delhi Administration, yesterday, to make an enquiry. He met Shri Bramhanand at the crossing near the north gate of Parliament House and recorded his statement. He also recorded the statements of the District Magistrate, the Additional District Magistrate, the Watch and Ward Officer of the Parliament House, the SDM, Parliament Street and police officers concerned in the affair. The Chief Secretary's conclusions are: (1) that Shri Brahmanand and his followers had been trying to court arrest; the magistrate and the police, however, did not consider their arrest necessary....

Shri Hem Barua (Mangalore): What do you mean by trying to court arrest?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: I will explain everything. Please have patience. .. By getting into the police trucks at about 3 p.m. on 5th April, Shri Brahmanand and his followers were under the erroneous impression that they had succeeded in getting themselves arrested. There was, in fact, no arrest and they were not forced to get into trucks. Shri Brahmanand and his followers were treated with courtesy at Parliament Street Police Station. They remained in the Police Station for about two hours with a view to getting themselves arrested. When they did not succeed, they dispersed. These are the conclusions of the Chief Seceretary.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Speaker: Let him finish his statement.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : क्या मंत्री महोदय ने अधिकारियों की इन बातों पर विश्वास कर लिया है ?

Shri Y. B. Chavan: You will have to see the whole background. I am as keen and as jealous of the rights of the Members of Parliament as every member should be. But here is a very different background of the question. The procedure of informing Parliament about the arrest of a member is there because a Member will have to attend the session of Parliament. But here is a Member of Parliament who wanted to be arrested and, therefore, the facts get confused. So, really speaking, the question is whether in fact the member in question was arrested or not. The conclusion of the Chief Secretary which I read is that he was not in fact arrested.... (*Interruptions*). Please listen to me, because I am making a statement. I am in your hands. I am in the hands of the House. If really speaking, the House wants and you want that the whole question should be gone into by the Privileges Committee, I would welcome it, because it is much better that these inquiries fix the responsibility. Because, the responsibilities of the Members of Parliament are also then made clear. Otherwise, the low and order agencies get confused. How are they to function? Here was a Member of Parliament who wanted to get himself arrested and, looking to their own responsibilities, they refused to arrest him. This has been made the issue of privilege. Therefore, I do not want to take a position as if I want to come in the way of the Privileges Committee going into the facts of the case. I am completely in your hands. If you feel that it should be referred to the Privileges Committee, I have no objection.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :(बलरामपुर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने कल माननीय सदस्य,

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता, को इजाजत दी कि वह विशेषाधिकार का मामला यहां उठायें। गृह मंत्री ने अपने उत्तर में कहा है कि वह इस बात के लिये तैयार हैं कि यह सारा मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंप दिया जाये। इसलिये मैं यह प्रस्ताव करता हूं कि यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति को जांच के लिये सौंप दिया जाये।

Mr. Speaker: He can move the motion then.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूं :

> 'कि दिल्ली की पुलिस के द्वारा 5 अप्रैल, 1967 को इस सदन के माननीय सदस्य, स्वामी ब्रह्मानन्द, की गिरफ्तारी तथा रिहाई की सूचना लोक सभा अध्यक्ष को न देने के सम्बन्ध में सदन क विशेषाधिकार के हनन का जो मामला माननीय सदस्य, श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता, ने पेश किया है, उसको सदन को विशेषाधिकार समिति को सौंप दिया जाये और यह निर्देश दिया जाये कि समिति अपना प्रतिवेदन आगामी सत्र के पहले दिन पेश करे।

Shri A. K. Sen (Calcutta North West): There should be a little change; it should be "alleged arrest" because it is not admitted that he has been arrested.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे यह शब्द जोड़ने में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन. . . . .

Mr. Speaker: Will you kindly sit down. We are sending the case to the Privileges Committee. It is the Privileges Committe that has to establish the truth or otherwise of this case. We have not decided it. It is only an allegation now. Now if the House takes a decision, why should it go to the Privileges Committee? There will actually be nothing to refer to the Privileges Committee. Then there will be nothing to go to the Privileges Committee. Therefore you should yourself accept the amendment and put in that word "alleged" because it is going to the Privileges Committee.

श्री ए० के० सेन : हिन्दी में होगा : "तथा-कथित ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : "कथित' ।

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North East): Mr. Speaker, I am putting in only because after 15 years in this House I am floundering in this formidable company and I do wish you to give us some guiding ideas. What I discover is that the Home Minister comes and makes a statement in which he tells us to believe that there has been a Member of Parliament, who was going on a joy spree, just trying to get arrested.... (*Interruption*). I want you please to take a more serious view of this matter.

We have a very definite convention not merely a convention but, I am sure, very much better than a rule, that when intimation is not given by an officer of Government regarding the arrest and detention of a Member of Parliament, it becomes *ipso facto* and immediately a violation of the privilege of this House.

Mr. Speaker: I am not allowing any discussion.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: What I wish to point out to you is that I find myself completely unable to function in this House if everything is conducted in this manner not only on one side but on every side.

What I discover is that statements were made—you call it an allegation: I do not mind—that a Member of Parliament has been arrested and detained; therefore, intimation not having been furnished to you, the privilege has been attracted. That is

the proposition made. The Home Minister took his time over it and after cogitation over last night he makes a statement here the purport of which is making fun of Members of Parliament.... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: What is the point you want to make? The whole case has been explained.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Are we in this case to truckle down to ministerial pronouncements which imply that Members of this House and perhaps any other citizen are at liberty to jump into police vans, to be taken to Police headquarters and treated courteously and then to be let off somewhere? He says that there was no arrest and no detention; nothing has happened. Have we to swallow this kind of a thing? I want to know if we are going to be treated by Ministers to this kind of exhibition of bad manners.... (*Interruption*). You make an appeal to us to behave with dignity, but there must be some reciprocity about this. We are expected surely to behave with dignity and all that sort of thing, but dignity is a two-way game. If reflections are made by Ministers, I can understand the Minister coming to this House and saying, "I apologise"......(*Interruption*).

Shri Y. B. Chavan: Why?

Mr. Speaker: He has moved the motion. I hope that word has been incorporated. Now I shall put the motion to the vote of the House.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): Sir, I want to speak on it.

Mr. Speaker: No I am not allowing any debate.... (*Interruption*).

The question is:

"That the question of privilege raised by Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta regarding the failure of the Delhi Police to inform the Speaker, Lok Sabha, about the alleged arrest and release of Swami Brahmanand, a member of this House, on the 5th April, 1967, be referred to the Committee of Privileges with instructions to report by the First day of the next Session."

The motion was adopted.

12.19 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act

The Deputy Minister in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Muthyal Rao): On behalf of Shri Dinesh Singh,

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the following Notifications under subsection (3) of section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963:—

(i) The Export of Cashew Kernels (Quality Control and Inspection) Second Amendment Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. S.O. 3603 in Gazette of India dated the 26th November, 1966.

(ii) The Export of Rubber Belts (Inspection) Rules, 1966, published in Notification No. S.O. 80 in Gazette of India dated the 5th January, 1967.

(iii) The Export of Electric Cables and Conductors (Inspection) Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. S.O. 836 in Gazette of India dated the 10th March, 1967.

[*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-320/67.]

Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, Rules.

The Minister of Health and Family Planning (Dr. S. Chandrasekhar):

Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, Rules, 1967, published in Notification No. G.S.R. 460 in Gazette of India dated the 29th March, 1967, under sub-section (3) of section 31 of the Post-graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, Act, 1966. [*Placed in the Library. See* No. LT-321/67.]

12.20 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the House that I have received the following message dated the 6th April, 1967, from the President:—

"I have received with great satisfaction the expression of thanks by the Members of the Lok Sabha for the Address I delivered to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 18th March, 1967".

12.20½ hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1967

The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai):

Sir, I beg to move*:

"That the Bill to continue for the financial year 1967-68 the existing rates of income-tax with certain modifications and the existing rates of annuity deposits and to provide for the continuance of certain commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the discontinuance of the duty on salt for the said year, be taken into consideration."

As I mentioned in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this short Bill merely seeks to continue the existing tax structure for the financial year 1967-68, subject to certain modifications in relation to income-tax and also to continue the existing rates of annuity deposits required to be made under the Income-tax Act. I do not, therefore, propose to take the time of this House in discussing the details of the tax rates and annuity deposits. I would only explain two of the important features of the Bill.

12.22 hrs.

[Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya *in the Chair*]

The first feature to which I would refer is the one which relates to the provisions made in the annual Finance Acts during the past few years to provide certain tax rebates to stimulate exports. These rebates which are available to assessees other than foreign companies comprise, firstly, a rebate of 10 per cent of the tax attributable to the export profits and, secondly, in the case of manufacturers of specified commodities, an additional rebate of tax calculated at the average rate of tax on 2 per cent of the sale proceeds of the articles manufactured and exported by them or sold by them to an exporter in India. These rebates were granted under the schemes for providing special incentives for promotion of exports which were in operation prior to the devaluation of the rupee. With the devaluation of the rupee in June last, the justification for continuing these special incentives has ceased to exist. In fact, simultaneously with the announcement of the devaluation of the rupee, Government had announced the discontinuance of the various export promotion schemes and incentives in force prior to the date of devaluation. In conformity with this policy, the Bill seeks to provide for the continuance of the tax rebates in relation to exports only with reference to exports or sales to exporters made before the date of devaluation and not with reference to exports or sales made thereafter.

The second feature relates to the provision in the Finance Act of 1966 for the levy of an additional income-tax on domestic companies of certain categories with reference to their distributions of equity dividends in excess of 10 per cent of the paid-up equity capital. This tax is leviable on domestic companies other than those which are required compulsorily to distribute dividends upto the statutory percentage of their distributable income. The provisions in the Bill for the levy of this tax are, in substance, the same as in the Finance Act of 1966. Thus, under the Finance Act of 1966, as also under the Bill, the additional tax is to be calculated at the rate of 7½ per cent on the company's total

*Moved with the Recommendation of the President.

income to the extent of the relevant amount of distributions of dividends by it. The relevant amount of distributions of dividends comprise, in both cases, firstly, the amount of equity dividends distributed by the company in the preceding years on which the tax at 7-1/2 per cent was chargeable but could not be charged due to insufficiency of the total income with reference to which the liability to this tax is measured, and secondly, the amount of equity dividends distributed during the relevant accounting year in excess of 10 per cent of the company's paid-up capital.

Before concluding, I would refer to the statement made in this House on November 21, 1966, by the then Finance Minister, announcing certain measures for providing income-tax relief to industry in consequence of devaluation of the rupee. The main relief announced by him was that where capital plant and machinery was imported by industry from abroad before the date of devaluation on deferred payment terms or against foreign loans, the cost of such assets would be allowed to be written-up by the amount of the additional rupee liability incurred by industry in paying the instalments of the cost or the foreign loans, and depreciation, but not development rebate, would be allowed with reference to the cost so written up. He had further stated that to implement these and other ancillary measures announced by him, Government would be sponsoring the necessary amendments to the Income Tax Act at the next suitable opportunity. I would like to inform hon. Members that I fully endorse the measures outlined by the then Finance Minister in his statement. I have not included in this Bill the amendments to the Income Tax Act necessary to implement these measures as the Bill is limited in its scope to the continuance of the existing tax structure and the time at the disposal of the House to consider its provisions is also limited.

For these reasons, I do not intend to move the amendments to the Bill in this matter of which I had given notice earlier. I propose to introduce these amendments through the main Finance Bill which will be presented here some time in May 1967. I may add that on the passage of the main Finance Bill into law those amendments would be effective for and from the assessment year 1967-68 and would thus cover incomes earned during the accounting year in which devaluation took place.

I trust that the proposals in this short Bill will receive the unanimous approval of this House.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to continue for the financial year 1967-68 the existing rates of income-tax with certain modifications and the existing rates of annuity deposits and to provide for the continuance of certain commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the discontinuance of the duty on salt for the said year, be taken into consideration".

Shri Piloo Mody (Godhra): Mr. Chairman, I get up today primarily to console myself because I know, no matter what I do, the Finance Minister is going to run away with a lot of money, and no matter what I say, that money is going to be misspent.

An hon. Member: How?

Shri Piloo Mody: Misspent in a great many ways which I shall explain shortly.

I was hoping that even a vote on account in today's economic conditions called for some reduction of the burden that this economic has been carrying. Unfortunately, I see no signs of it, instead of which the misspending continues, and continues generally under three broad heads.

The public sector, which is the pet pastime of the Congress Government for the last 10-15 years, has been consuming whatever surpluses that this country produces at an alarming rate. I would like to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to a special study conducted by the Economic and Scientific Research Foundation in which it

[Shri Piloo Mody].

was stated that this country has lost by way of production and yield Rs. 588 crores on companies which have been in existence over the last 5 years; and this does not take into account the moneys that have been spent on the steel industry. It has also been projected that at the end of the Fourth Five Year Plan, the loss by way of production to this country as a result of the public sector may very well be something in the neighbourhood of Rs. 2,000 crores. This is the price the country has had to pay, the economy has had to pay, the people have had to pay for pandering to the public sector.

Another head under which expenditure is being incurred at an alarming rate is what is commonly called the bureaucracy. There has been an indiscriminate increase of departments, an indiscriminate increase of government jobs, and the Finance Minister, who until recently presided over the Administrative Reforms Commission, came up with certain suggestions. But I find that even on the basis of the interim report, there is absolutely no intention on the part of Government to curtail any expenditure whatsoever.

We have had in the past the sorry spectacle of seeing the governments of this country being run by ministries which are not geared to the needs of government, but are being geared to the needs of the Congress Party, primarily to satisfy the dissident elements within the Party. Otherwise, how could you explain, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Madras can be run with 8 Ministers but the Government of Maharashtra requires 28 Ministers? How can you explain the Government of Orissa being run by 14 Ministers and the Government of Rajasthan requiring 24 Ministers? Are there any more functions that the people in Rajasthan and Maharashtra have to perform?

As far as the Centre is concerned, its tally last year was 57. I fail to understand what 57 people can do for this country by way of functions that they perform whereas in various States only 8 are required. This is how money has been spent.

I cite the example of the ministries and not the whole host of other activities in which money is spent because this is the apex, this is what highlights the expenditure of the Congress Governments.

The Third head under which a great deal of money is being messpent is of course, corruption, corruption and leakage which is inherent in the permit licence *raj* system that the Congress Government has been adopting over the last 10—15 years.

And yet, in spite of all this waste of money, in spite of this monumental expenditure, there are three critical sectors of the economy which are being starved. I was very happy to hear the Finance Minister a few minutes ago saying that he attaches the highest priority to agriculture. In the past, we have heard the late Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, also saying similar things. We have heard in the past other Ministers giving that assurance. The late Lal Bahadur Shastri gave us a solemn assurance on that point. We have been hearing this that agriculture is receiving the highest priority. But unfortunately, it does not reflect itself in the figures of the Five Year Plans. It has not done so in the Second Plan, it has not done so in the Third Plan, it has not done so in the draft outline of the Fourth Plan. I am afraid we cannot possibly take these assurances at their face value.

Agriculture, infra-structure, roads, transport, communications, power—these are sectors of the economy which it is the business of Government to promote, and yet these are being starved at the expense of the so-called public sector.

Social overheads. Look at the condition of education in this country. Look at the condition of health in this country. What is the expenditure that has been incurred. Look at the quality of our education. If

money was being spent on these, nobody would have objected to the taxation structure. Unfortunately, we have got accustomed to the fact that we have to suffer these orgies of financial misspending, of over-taxation, of over-borrowing, reckless deficit financing, the violent nature of the tax structure.

The tax structure, for the last few years, has really been geared to the personality of the Finance Minister. First it was TTK, then it was MD, then again TTK, and then after a brief spell it is again MD. This is how the taxation policies of the country have been oscillating like a pendulum with absolutely no indication that we will achieve a stable tax structure over the future. How are businessmen, entrepreneurs and industrialists to plan their activity? Government believe in planning, talk about perspective planning, but I think they refer to it only for themselves because with the present fiscal policies that are being followed, it is impossible for any man to gear his thinking and to plan for the future.

About over-legislation, of course, we need not say very much. We have been having over-legislation with very few legislators present over the last so many years.

But before I conclude, I must refer to the rather pathetic plea that was made by the Prime Minister recently about one thing: co-operation from all sections of the House. Her Government is in difficulty and she wants co-operation. We are willing to give this co-operation but we wish certain co-operation from them as well. The only co-operation we wish from them is that they listen to us, they take our advice and they follow the policies that we advocate. That is all the co-operation we want from them and in return to it we are prepared to raise our hands everytime they speak. But unfortunately they do not wish to give anything; they only wish to take. Only this morning in a function which the Finance Minister attended, he referred to the lack of confidence and lack of trust. I think he had a point there; a very small point. I think it is necessary that we do improve the trust between the Government, business and labour and all other sections of the community. It cannot be done if the lines of communication are cut off between the ministries and the rest of the people of India. This Government, not even with 280 ministers, is likely to hold on very long. In the Lobby one hears a great deal; already they have gone and appointed 52 ministers. In the lobbies, it is said: the pack of cards is complete; everybody is looking for the joker. Who will be the joker? I regret that I have come to this sad conclusion and my friends on the Treasury Benches will forgive me for saying so—the heads in the Treasury Benches are as empty as the treasury itself. Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman: There are a number of speakers and I would request them not to take more than ten minutes each.

Shri Himatsingka (Godda): Sir, I have heard the speech of the hon. Member Mr. Mody and also the complaint that large amounts of money are invested in the public sector undertakings. There is no doubt about investment of large funds in public sector undertakings. Some of them are not giving the results that they should or that were expected. I have no doubt that if they are geared up and managed properly, they should be able to relieve a lot of pressure that is being put by way of taxation and otherwise.

As regards health and education, there are no grounds for complaint. A large number of diseases which were prevalent in the country have practically been eradicated. The like-span has increased. There has

[Shri Himatsingka].

been all round improvement so far as health is concerned.

I feel that there is room for cutting down the expenditure to a large extent; the money thus saved can be put into proper use for improving agriculture and other industries which will help in the production of goods that we badly need and that would relieve the inflationary pressure on our economy. Therefore, steps should be taken by the Government to cut down expenditure as far as possible in a number of ministries and it is possible if there is co-operation between the different ministries and the Finance Ministry. I feel that there is room for reduction of expenditure and I am glad that the deficit that was shown in the vote on account budget, of about Rs. 350 crores, has actually been reduced to about Rs. 150 crores. The result on the 31st March shows that the deficit that was put down at about Rs. 350 crores has come down to Rs. 150 crores only; it is seen from the report of the Reserve Bank recently published. Moreover, the expenditure includes about Rs. 100 crores on the purchases of accessories and other inventories; that should not be treated as expenditure, because there is a corresponding asset there. Therefore, the actual deficit is much less than what was shown in the vote on account budget that was placed before the House. That is what appears from the latest report of the Reserve Bank, and other figures that have been published in the *Economic Times* and so on. That is a very healthy sign and I feel that steps should be taken to improve the economic conditions in the country because at present there is practically no new industry coming up; there is practically no industry being put up on account of the want of capital; there is no money in the country and foreign capital is not coming, and as a result, there is practically want of production and want of various consumer articles needed in the country. On the contrary, there is a paradox in the country. Certain things that are in production, for them there are no purchasers, and for others there is a shortage of goods. It shows that the country's economy is in a bad way. People have not got money to purchase various things that they need; whatever they can save is practically utilised and spent in the purchase of foodgrains. There is not any money left for the purchase of other articles that they need. Therefore, the saving with the people must be allowed to be increased, and that can only be done if there is a good deal of reduction in the personal taxes as also on the taxes of the companies, thereby allowing them to save money which they can plough back in industries and increase their production capacity. That is to say, there is room, and steps must be taken to reduce the expenditure, reduce the taxes on companies as also the personal taxes so that money can be left with the investors to invest in the industries that are very badly needed to be set up.

If the corporate taxes are also reduced considerably, that will enable companies to plough back and expand their activities and also put in money in other productive enterprises. Therefore, it is necessary for the Finance Minister to take bold steps to set the economy of the country going, an economy which is in a very bad state for the last three to five years and which has brought this country to this pitiable state. If bold steps are taken to reduce expenditure, that will enable the Government not to impose any new taxes because there is no room for any additional taxes being imposed. If that is done, I hope that the country's economy will go forward and the difficulties that we are passing through will be very much alleviated.

Of course, as the Finance Minister has already said, attention has got to be given to agriculture, because that is one o fthe most necessary subjects which needs attention. If we do not increase our food production, it will

cause very great difficulty for the country. A large number of agricultural products are also needed by industries. Therefore, I feel that attention must be paid to provide various inputs that are required to increase the capacity of the country for increasing production. I feel Government should pay attention to that.

श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा (अमृतसर) : सभापति महोदय, वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने अंतरिम वित्त व्यवस्था की दृष्टि से जिस वित्त विधेयक को उपस्थित किया है मैं आप की सेवा में आप के माध्यम से कुछ तथ्य सदन के सामने रखना चाहता हूं।

मुझे ऐसा अनुभव हुआ कि आज की परिस्थिति और बीते कुछ 19--20 वर्षों के अनुभव से इस विधेयक को देख कर ऐसा लगता है कि कांग्रेस शासन कोई सबक़ सीखना नहीं चाहता है। आर्थिक संकट की आज की सारी स्थिति को शासक दल विकास का संकट कह करके आम जनता को और इस सदन को समझाने की कोशिश कर रहा है। मैं समझता हूं कि यह विकास का संकट नहीं है यह नीतियों और उन की कार्यान्विति की भूलों का परिणाम है और मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक विनाश की स्थिति है। अगर हम समय रहते और सरकार अपनी नीतियों में सुधार करके और देश की परिस्थिति का ठीक ठीक विचार करते हुए राष्ट्रीय साधनों का उपयोग करके एक अगर क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन हमारे देश की आर्थिक स्थिति में नहीं किया जाता तो यह संकट हमारे लिए अनेक प्रकार से घातक होगा।

स्वदेशी की बात प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने कही है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि उन्होंने यह जो स्वदेशी का नारा दिया है यह नारा बड़ा आनन्द देने वाला है लेकिन नारे से बात नहीं बनेगी। स्वदेशी और विदेश की अनेक बातें यह दोनों मिल कर किस तरीक़े से चलायेंगे ? आज हमारे देश में पूंजी विदेशी है। आज हमारे देश की योजनाएं लगभग विदेशी हैं। आज हमारे देश की तकनीकी विदेशी है और यह सारी की सारी चीजें विदेशी हैं और फिर उस के ऊपर केवल नारा स्वदेशी तो मुझे लगता है यह बात बन नहीं पायेगी। इस से देश को कोई लाभ नहीं होगा। निश्चित रूप से अगर हमें स्वदेशी का विचार करना है तो फिर स्वदेशी एक व्यवहार की प्रक्रिया है। स्वदेशी आचार का मंत्र है इस नाते से मैं वित्त मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि कम से कम देश को आर्थिक व्यवस्थाओं के अन्दर वे स्वदेशी का अधिक से अधिक विचार करें और अगर वे स्वदेशी का विचार करेंगे तो उस नाते से फिर स्वदेशी श्रम शक्ति का विचार अनिवार्य हो जाता है। स्वदेशी श्रम शक्ति आज हमारे स्वदेश के अन्दर अपने देश के अन्दर श्रम शक्ति से अपने देश की मानवी शक्ति से कम से कम सम्पन्न हैं, बाक़ी पूंजी की बातें विवादास्पद हो सकती हैं। मुझे दु:ख है कि आज जिस तरीक़े से आटोमेशन लाया गया है एल० आई० सी० के अन्दर उस से हमारी श्रम शक्ति की अवहेलना की गई है। गति और दक्षता के नाम पर देश की मानवी शक्ति की इस प्रकार से अवहेलना मुझे लगता है इस तरीक़े से अगर हम चलेंगे तो मानव को मशीन खा जायगी। मशीन का जनसंघ विरोधी नहीं है। हम मशीन को लाने का विरोध नहीं करते हैं लेकिन मशीन हमारे लिए है। हम मशीन की बलि नहीं दिये जा सकते हैं। हमारी आवश्यकताओं की दृष्टि से सामान्य जीवन की आय को बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से देश के उत्पादन को बढ़ाने की दृष्टि से मशीन जिस हद तक हम चाहें काम में लायें, नये साधन जिस हद तक हम चाहें लायें। विदेशी सहायता का भी जनसंघ विरोधी नहीं है, हम विरोधी नहीं हैं। हम समझते हैं कि विदेशी सहायता हमारे तरीक़ों से, हमारे जिसे कहना चाहिए कि ढंगों के ऊपर, हमारी शर्तों के ऊपर और हमारे विकास की दिशा के अनुकूल अगर हमें

[श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा]

विदेशी सहायता मिलती है तो हमें अवश्य लेनी चाहिए लेकिन जो विदेशी सहायता धीरे धीरे हमारी साधन सम्पन्नता को, हमारी सब प्रकार की कार्यक्षमता को कुंठित करती है मुझे लगता है आज जिस तरीक़े से पी० एल० 480 को चलाया जा रहा है मेरे देश के किसानों के ऊपर वह कुल्हाड़े की तरह से काम कर रहा है। आज हमारे देश की औद्योगिक स्थिति के अन्दर जिस तरीक़े की अव्यवस्थाएं और विदेशी पूंजी है, वह उस के ऊपर छाती चली जा रही है। वे कम्पनियां जिनके अन्दर स्वदेशी साधनों का उपयोग होता है वह आज अपने आप को इस तरीक़े से दबा हुआ पा रही हैं। करों की व्यवस्था के अन्दर लालफीताशाही की सुविधाओं के अन्दर जहां स्वदेशी साधनों का उपयोग होता है मैं समझता हूं कि वह लाल-फ़ीतेशाही की जकड़ से उन को सुविधा मिलने की आवश्यकता है। इस से मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हूं कि आज देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था के अन्दर हमें इस बात का विचार करना होगा कि यह घाटे का बजट अब नहीं चलेगा। आज घाटे के बजट के बारे में समय समय पर यहां कहा जाता है कि हम घाटे के बजट को रोक कर चलेंगे। लेकिन मुझे यहां शायर की बात ही चरितार्थ होती नजर आती है कि :

"शाम को पी, सुबह को तोबा कर ली,
रिन्द के रिन्द रहे, हाथ से जन्नत न गई।"

मैं समझता हूं कि कांग्रेस के महानुभाव इस बात का विचार कर लें कि शायर ने यह रास्ता निकाल लिया होगा बीच का, उस कवि का काम इस बीच की व्यवस्था से चल गया होगा, लेकिन अगर कांग्रेस के लोग यह सोचें कि जन्नत न जाँय तो आधी जन्नत तो उन के हाथ से खिसक चुकी है, आधी और खिसक जायेगी अगर उनकी नीतियां न बदलीं।

इस नाते से मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आज कृषि का उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिये किसान को सुविधायें देनी होंगी। हम कृषि का मशीनीकरण करना चाहते हैं तो करें, लेकिन सब से बड़ा सवाल यह है कि हम कितना मशीनीकरण कर पा रहे हैं। आज किसानों को बैल की जरूरत है लेकिन जब शासन से गाय की रक्षा करने की बात कही जाती है तो उस को साम्प्रदायिकता का सवाल कह कर टालने की बात की जाती है। आखिर इसमें साम्प्रदायिकता कहां से आ गई? किसान को बैल चाहिये, इसी तरीके से भूमि को गोबर चाहिये, आखिर देश में किसानों को काम करने की शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिये दूध और घी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि इन सारी बातों के लिये हमें एक राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण अपनाना चाहिये। जो कुछ हमारे देश में है उस का अधिक से अधिक उपयोग हम करें और जो हमारे पास नहीं है उसकी अधिक से अधिक बचत करें। जो विदेशी सहायता के सूत्र हैं, जो हमारे जीवन की स्वतन्त्रता और हमारे जीवन की स्वायत्तता को चारों ओर से जकड़ते चले जा रहे हैं, उन से हम बचने की कोशिश करें। मुझे लगता है कि जिस तरीके से सारा अवमूल्यन हुआ उसी तरह से कहीं हम और तो नहीं जकड़ते जा रहे है।

बाकी बातें मैं नहीं उठाना चाहता हूं, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि सीमावर्ती प्रदेशों में, खास कर पंजाब में जो स्थिति है, उस को देख कर पता चलता है कि वहां की सीमावर्ती समस्या निरन्तर बनी हुई है। अमृतसर के किसानों के खेतों को अगर जा कर देखा जाये तो वहां सेनाओं की गतिविधियां हैं। अगर हम को अपने शत्रु की चालों से बच कर रहना है तो हम को अपनी सीमाओं को सुदृढ़ करना है। अगर हमारी सीमाओं पर

हमारी सेनाओं की गतिविधियां चलेंगी तो वह खेतों में जायेंगी और सब जगह जायेंगी . .

श्री बलराज मधोक (दिल्ली—दक्षिण) : मैं चाहूंगा कि मंत्री महोदय माननीय सदस्य की ओर ध्यान दें ।

श्री यज्ञदत्त शर्मा : मुझे क्षमा करें । मैं आज पहले दिन आया हूं, बाद में तो उन का ध्यान मैं अपनी ओर खींच ही लूंगा ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मैं सुन रहा था ।

श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा : वैसे तो आप की प्रतिभा बहुमुखी है फिर भी जरा इधर ध्यान दें ।

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि आखिर अमृतसर में किसानों के खेतों में सेनायें जाती हैं, लेकिन उन को किसी प्रकार का आश्वासन नहीं है । आज खेमकरण का किसान रोता रहता है, आज भी फीरोजपुर और फाजिल्का के खेतों के अन्दर वहां का किसान आश्वासित नहीं है । उस को आश्वासित करना होगा ।

अमृतसर की इंडस्ट्रीज का विचार किया जाय तो पिछले कई वर्षों से वहां की इंडस्ट्रीज आकाश से ऊपर उड़ रही हैं । उन के कच्चे माल पर रोक लगी हुई है । बाकी प्रदेशों में जिस प्रकार करों की व्यवस्था है उसी प्रकार का दबाव अमृतसर की इंडस्ट्रीज पर भी है । मैं समझता हूं कि सीमाओं के ऊपर जिन लोगों को बैठना है, जिन को शत्रु की गोलियों के सामने बैठ कर हमारे देश के उत्पादन को बढ़ाना है, जिन को अपने उत्पादन को कायम कर के उद्योगों पर पलना है, जिन को अपनी निजी पूंजी लगानी है देश में, उन को हमें उचित तरीके से आश्वासित करना होगा, उन को आश्वासन देना होगा । मुझे इस बात की शिकायत है कि सरकार की ओर से वहां के लोगों को इस प्रकार का कोई आश्वासन प्राप्त नहीं है ।

मैं समझता हूं कि हमारा राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण भी आज इस सम्बन्ध में बने और सारी समस्याओं को हम टुकड़े-टुकड़े कर के देखने की कोशिश न करें । मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि राष्ट्रीय दृष्टि से हम राष्ट्रीय मल्यों का मान नहीं कर पा रहे हैं । हम देखते है कि भगत सिंह की समाधि जो फीरोजपुर के अन्दर है, उसकी ओर सरकार ध्यान नहीं दे रही है । सवाल हमारे राष्ट्रीय मानदंड का है । सावरकर की मृत्यु के बाद डाक टिकट उन के नाम से चलाने की घोषणा केन्द्रीय सरकार ने की लेकिन आज तक वह टिकट जारी नहीं हुआ है । मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूं कि भगत सिंह की समाधि को राष्ट्रीय मन्दिर के रूप में सरकार अपने हाथ में ले, एक राष्ट्रीय चिन्ह के रूप में अपने हाथ में ले और उस को बनाने की कोशिश करे ।

पंजाब की स्थिति के अन्दर पंजाब के साधन और सामर्थ्य उस के पराक्रम और पौरुष की द्योतक हैं जिस तरीके से पंजाब का बटवारा हुआ है, लेकिन मैं समझता हूं कि जब यह व्यवस्था आ गई है तो सरकार को उस को अपने पांवों पर खड़ा करने के लिये कुछ विशेष ध्यान देना होगा । वहां पर राजनीतिक परिस्थिति जो है वह आज कुछ डांवाडोल है । मैं जानता हूं कि आज वहां पर जिस तरीके से विधान सभा का स्थगन हुआ है उस के लिये कांग्रेस के भाई जिम्मेदार हैं । वह समझते हैं कि उन को वहां पर लोकतंत्र को चलने नहीं देना है । मैं अपने भाइयों से यह बात कहना चाहता हूं कि यहां की राजनीति पर आप की छाप रही है । इस लोकतंत्र की परम्पराओं और मर्यादाओं को खत्म करने की जिम्मेदारी आप के ऊपर है । वह इस बात को विचार कर के चलें कि यदि वह इस तरीके से केले के छिलके से फिसल फिसल कर चलने की कोशिश करेंगे तो बात नहीं बनेगी, भले ही अपनी सत्ता में वह इस को बनाने की कोशिश करें ।

[श्री यज्ञ दत्त शर्मा]

इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हू कि हमारी आर्थिक नीतियों मे एक मौलिक परिवर्तन हो और जो हमारे सीमावर्ती प्रदेश हैं जिन के अन्दर हमारी सुरक्षा की समस्या के कारण वहां की आर्थिक व्यवस्था डावांडोल है उन की ओर हमारी सरकार एक विशेष ध्यान दे, खेती बाड़ी के उत्पादन की दृष्टि से और उद्योगों की व्यवस्था की दृष्टि से ।

Shri N. K. P. Salve (Betul): At the outset I must congratulate the Finance Minister for having withdrawn the amendment he was seeking to introduce because the amendment was not merely outside the scope of the Finance Bill, but the way in which it had been drafted—one of the important provisions in sub-section (ii) of the proposed section 43A—was likely to be violative of Article 14 of the Constitution and would have joined the plethora of sections which have been struck down by the Supreme Court.

In view of the categorical statement by the Finance Minister in his budget speech and now that the Finance Bill and the budget proposals are merely interim measures, I feel that the quantitatively, voluminous triade of criticism unleashed by the hon members of the Opposition was only disproportionate to the exigencies of the occasion.

The hon. members of the Communist Party and their friends accused us of being die-hard reactionaries and, therefore, our fiscal policy was attacked for serving the interests of capitalists. We were accused of enacting tax laws which were not sufficiently stringent and, therefore, wide scale tax evasion was prevalent in the country. We were also accused of administering the laws inefficiently, which was another cause for the prevalence of widespread tax evasion. We were also told that the indirect taxes which had been levied by us were heavier than the direct taxes and it was suggested that a part of the indirect taxes should be unloaded and loaded on the direct taxes; as to the direct taxes, they were not sufficiently burdensome and even if they were burdensome, they needed to be enhanced. I submit that the gravamen of their charge was that the taxmanship in India had hopelessly failed for having rested too much on policies to the extreme right of the centre.

On the other hand, the hon. members of the Swatantra Party and their friends accused us of following fiscal policies in which we had burdened the tax-payers with taxes excessively. They had attributed that the present stagnation into which our economy had sunk was due to the excessive burden of taxes and to the unpragmatic and unrealistic laws which had been enacted in the course of the preceding years and, therefore, it was suggested that we should reduce the burden of taxes in a manner as though the Finance Minister must not seek to augment the revenues flowing into the exchequer from the direct taxes. It was suggested that along with deficit financing, the Finance Minister should accept to stifle the augmentation of revenues to the exchequer from direct taxes, and, if necessary, to balance the budget, there should be a slashing of the Plan, there should be a pruning of the Plan. The gravamen of the charge of the other section of critics was that the taxmanship in India had hopelessly failed for having rested too much on policies to the extreme left of the centre.

It is undoubtedly true that we are passing through a very serious economic crisis, but it is unfortunate that the evaluation of the causes of the economic crisis and the remedies which are sought to be made out by the two sections of critics, have been viewed through coloured glasses of the political and economic philosophies, to which the two sections of the critics, respectively, subscribe. On points, I submit, they are charges which appear utterly tendentious and

have been levelled with the object of buttressing the claims of superiority of the political and economic creed of their admiration. And the remedies suggested reveal a manifestation of their faith in efficacy of policies which conform to, and support, their own political and economic ideals.

13 hrs.

I beg to point out to my hon. friends in the Communist Party and their friends that we are a nation where the rates of taxation are not only the highest at the highest point but they continue to be the highest at each point of each slab. I have compared these rates with those in various countries—countries which desire an egalitarian or socialist pattern of society, whose objective is to establish a society based on the socialist or egalitarian patern. I have compared the rates with those countries which are developing countries. I have also compared them with those countries which could be considered as advanced, economically.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member may continue after Lunch. Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again at 2 p.m.

13.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

(The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at Fourteen of the Clock)

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

STATEMENT RE. GIFT PRESENTED TO P.M.

डा0 राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अध्यक्ष के आदेश नियम 115 के अन्तर्गत मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री के असत्य को सुधारना चाहता हूं ।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने लोक सभा में 18 मार्च 1967 को कहा, "यह सही है कि सऊदी अरेबिया के राजा ने मुझे एक हीरों का हार भेंट किया, लेकिन ऐसे उपहारों के बारे में सरकार के नियम बहुत ही सख्त और साफ़ हैं। हम लोगों को ऐसी भेंट रखने की इजाजत नहीं । वे तत्काल ख़जाने (तोशेख़ाने) भेज दिये जाते हैं। क्योंकि यह बहुमूल्य चीज़ थी यह रिज़र्व बैंक को दे दी गई ।" आधी एक मिनट के अन्दर उन्होंने फिर कहा, "मुझे तारीख का पता नहीं। वह मेरे कब्जे में नहीं था और इस लिये मैं नहीं जानती कि किसने और कब बैंक को दिया ।"

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दो परस्पर विरोधी बातें कहीं, जिनमें से एक जरूर झूठ है इन दो बातों के कहने के बीच मेरा सवाल जरूर हुआ था, "कितने दिन बाद में ?" शायद इसी सवाल ने उन्हें इतना घबड़ा दिया कि वह सच पूरा छिपा नहीं पाई। एक तरफ वह कहती हैं कि बहुमूल्य भेंट तत्काल तोशेख़ाने भेज दी जाती है और यह भेंट अधिक बहुमूल्य होने के कारण रिज़र्व बैंक भेज दी गई । दूसरी तरफ वह कहती हैं कि हार उन के कब्जे में नहीं था और वह नहीं जानतीं कि कब और किसने और किस तारीख़ को बैंक को दिया। दोनों बार वह सत्य नहीं बोल रही हैं और कहीं कोई चीज उन्हें छिपाने की ज़रूरत पड़ रही है।

जिस तरह उन्होंने लोक सभा में "तत्काल" शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया, उसी तरह 3 दिसम्बर 1966 को दूसरे सदन मे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था, "किंग आफ सऊदी अरेबिया से एक हीरे का हार मुझे दिया था और वह उसी समय रिज़र्व बैंक

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

को दे दिया गया।" "तत्काल", "उसी समय" ऐसे शब्द हैं, जिन में एक क्षण की देरी की गुंजाइश नहीं रहती।

दूसरे सदन में उसी 3 दिसम्बर को बेगम अनीस किदवई ने कहा था "सोने का हार हो या हीरों का हार हो या जवाहरात हों, वह पंडित जी के घर पर जा कर पहले एक हफ्ते तक हर आदमी देख सकता था—एक हफ्ते के बाद जो इन को प्रेजेन्ट वगैरह होता था, वह खजाने में दाखिल हो जाता था।"

कहीं कोई चीज़ बहुत गड़बड़ है। उल्टा मुझे बदनाम किया जाता है। जिन लोगों का पैसे ओ सम्पत्ति के मामले में रत्ती भर चरित्र नहीं बचा है, वे मुझे सदन में और बाहर बार-बार चरित्रहन्ता कहते हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी उस दिन कहा कि मैं अंधाधुंध और आधारहीन आरोप लगा रहा हूं। इस हीरे के हार के सम्बन्ध में मैंने कोई आरोप नहीं लगाये। जो आरोप हैं, वे प्रधान मंत्री जी और उनके दोस्तों के लगाये हुये हैं। उन से मैंने कुछ तर्क और नतीजे अवश्य निकाले। तथ्य प्रधानमंत्री जी के अपने दिये हुए हैं, तर्क और नतीजे मैंने निकाले हैं।

यह सवाल तो मैं अभी तक उठा ही नहीं पाया हूं कि एक औरत को किसी भी सभ्यता और मर्यादा के अनुसार परदेसियों से बहुमूल्य भेंटें लेनी चाहिए या नहीं। दूसरा सवाल यह भी है कि राजा-रानियों के अलावा —और उनके लिये भी नियम सख्त हैं—किसी सभ्य देश के प्रधान मंत्री अथवा उनके रिश्तेदार केवल यादगारी भेंटें लिया करते हैं, बहुमूल्य भेंटें कभी नहीं।

पिछले बीस वर्षों में लालच, भोग और संचय का युग रहा है बड़े लोगों के लिए, और रोग तथा ताड़ना गरीबों के लिये। इस युग की समाप्ति किये बिना खेती-कारखाने का सुधार असम्भव है।

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have carefully looked into my statements to which Dr. Lohia has drawn attention. My statement in the Rajya Sabha was made in response to an allegation which Shri Raj Narain made in that House, without prior notice. I pointed out that it was many years since I had received this particular gift, that I did not remember the exact date and that the gift was sent at that time to the Reserve Bank.

When Dr. Lohia asked me in this House on March 18 about the date on which the present had been sent to the Reserve Bank, I said; 'I do not know the date. It was not in my custody, and, therefore, I do not know who handed it over and at what time."

It will be seen that on both occasions I said that I was not sure about the date as the event related to a period more than ten years ago. The present was made to me by the King of Saudi Arabia during his visit in November'December, 1955. As soon as the present was made, my father and ' decided that it should not be retained, and, thereafter I had nothing more to do with it.

You will observe that my statements in the House were neither contradictory nor misleading.

However, I should like to take this opportunity to say that from records which I have since consulted, it appears that there were some consultations between the then Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari and Prime Minister Nehru about the most appropriate disposal of the presents received by my father and me from

the King of Saudi Arabia, and a certain view was taken about the disposal of the articles. Meanwhile, Shri Morarji Desai took over as Finance Minister. Records show that the Prime Minister wrote to him on the subject on 2nd April, 1958, referring to his discussions with Shri T. T. Krishnamachari about the disposal of the articles and the articles were sent to the Finance Ministry the following day by the Prime Minister's Secretariat. After further consultations with the Finance Ministry, the articles were finally disposed of through the Reserve Bank and the State Bank of India. I have already indicated to the Speaker and have also mentioned in my speech in the House in the debate on the President's Address why it will not be desirable to go into the manner of the disposal, price etc. If such details of presents received from foreign dignitaries are publicised, there may be unfortunate comparisons which may cause embarrassment to the foreign dignitaries, their governments and to our country.

There is one point which Dr. Lohia has raised. It is about Begum Anis Kidwai's statement. I do not think I am called upon to give an answer to a statement made by another Member. The statement was not made by me and I do not wish to say anything about it.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अब आप नियम 15 देखिये.... (व्यवधान) मैं सवाल नहीं पूछ रहा हूं। व्यवस्था के ऊपर नियम 15 की तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान खींच रहा हूं। अब आप मेहरबानी करके नियम सुनिये.... (व्यवधान)

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: No questions.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : व्यवस्था का प्रश्न तो सुनिये। मेरी प्रार्थना है आप रुकिए फिर निर्णय दीजिये।

Shri M. R. Krishna (Peddapalli): Why is he so particular about the date?

श्री मधु लिमये : तीन साल की अवधि बीच में बीत गई।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अब नियम है :

"The Speaker shall determine the time when a sitting of the House shall be adjourned *sine die* or to a particular day, or to an hour or part of the same day."

कि अध्यक्ष महोदय, लोक सभा की बैठक को स्थगित कर सकते हैं। मेरा प्रस्ताव है कि ऐसी घटना होने के बाद जब कि सरकार ने स्वयं अपने कथन मे साबित किया है कि वह इस गद्दी पर बैठने लायक नहीं है तो आप इस बैठक का स्थगन कर दीजिए... (व्यवधान) .... मुझे यह बोलने नहीं देंगे, इस से मुझे मतलब नहीं, मैं केवल स्थान का प्रस्ताव आप के सामने ला रहा हूं कि अब इस बैठक का स्थगन करिए।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has read the rule:

"The Speaker shall determine the time when a sitting of the House shall be adjourned *sine die* or to a particular day, or to an hour or part of the same day:

"Provided that the Speaker may, if he thinks fit, call a sitting of the House before the date . . ."

Here the past practice is taken into consideration.

The Speaker can exercise this right. But he has never exercised it before, so far as I know, and I am not going to exercise it.

श्री मधु लिमये : हां, श्री आप आज इस्तेमाल करिए, यही इन की जिन्दगी है।

Shri Shivaji Rao S Deshmukh (Parbhani): On a point of order....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Salve to continue his speech.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: My point of order arises out of the statement and the practice followed. This procedure will once for all have to be straightened out. This has been used by Member after Member not for offering any personal explanation but for personal accusation. The rule under which this statement is purported to have been made is rule 357....

श्री मधु लिमये : नहीं, यह व्यक्तिगत स्पष्टीकरण नहीं, आप कार्यसूची देखिए...

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी (गोपालगंज): आप कौन बोलने वाले हैं ? यह डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब बतायेंगे ।

श्री मधु लिमये : यह बात को हास्यास्पद बना रहे हैं, इसलिए उन को रोक रहा हूं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: This was not permitted under the rule he is quoting. He is mistaken. Let him please sit down.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Under which rule is it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Direction 115.

Shri R. D. Bhandare (Bombay Central): Rule 15 speaks of the inherent power of the Speaker to do what is contemplated there. Therefore, the hon. Member has no right to suggest anything of that kind.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have disallowed his point of order.

14.16 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1967—*contd.*

Shri N. K. P. Salve: I was pointing out in reply to the point made by hon. Members of the Communist Party who had said that the levies by way of direct taxation were not sufficiently burdensome whereas the indirect taxes were very heavy on the poor and that a part of the indirect taxes should be loaded on to the direct taxes. I was also pointing out that the rates of taxation in our country are not merely the highest but are the highest at each point of every slab of income.

This is hardly the time nor the occasion for me to point out in detail the disparities which exist in the rate of our country and other countries, countries which seek to establish a socialistic pattern of society. It may satisfy the hon. Members of the Communist Party to know that the penalty clauses are not merely stringent, but I submit that the laws of penalty are punitive, punitive to the point of being vexatious. It may satisfy them to know that for an alleged concealment of as much as Rs. 10, as is contained in a decision of the Bombay High Court under certain conditions, our laws are capable of levying a minimum statutory penalty of lakhs and lakhs of rupees.

I also submit that the suggestion made by the hon. Members of the Swatantra Party and their friends that the Finance Minister must not seek to augment the revenues by way of direct taxes is an utterly pernicious suggestion. I hope my party shall not have any use for a Finance Minister who does not relentlessly look forward to augmenting the revenues of the Government. The whole point is how to work out a modern and dynamic fiscal policy which will streamline our tax laws and levies. I would point out that the theory of a high rate of taxation for the purposes of a augmenting the revenue has ben long exiled into the limbo of exploded myths by the countries wich have achieved marvellous economic prosperity. I wish to point out that it is necessary for us to have a very pragmatic and dynamic fiscal policy which will give the necessary stimulus to the taxpayers.

The United States of America, Germany, Japan, Belgium, Holand. Nigeria, Ireland, not to speak of Sweden, the great exemplar of so-

cialism, have experimented with very dynamic, very pragmatic and extremely bold and courageous fiscal policies and fiscal laws, and nations which were standing under the shadow of economic collapse and political disaster were awakened to the possibilities which the magic of modern fiscal policy could achieve, and in fact, by pursuing such policies the State exchequers garnered golden grain. My submission is that reduction in the rate of taxation was found to be a very effective remedy to take the economy out of the stagnant condition into which it had sunk. In the United States some time in January 1963 President Kennedy, finding himself in a very difficult economic situation, thought of bringing about very courageous tax reforms. He slashed the rate of taxation from 91 to 70 per cent in the case of individuals, and from 52 to 48 per cent in the case of the corporate sector. Of course, the Bill was passed after the President had died, but it was he who had contemplated the Bill. The result in the United States was that there was an unprecedent growth in income of 14,000 milion dollars and the revenues of the Government reached an all time high.

As against that, if our performance is to be seen, the rate of taxation in our country which was at 81.25 per cent has risen today to 89.375 per cent by the Finance Act, 1966. This was on unearned income. On earned income, the rate went up from 74.75 per cent to 82·225 per cent.

We were led to making the most unfortunate commentary in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Budget that we were short in our actual collections, that against an estimate of Rs. 666·2 crores, our actual collections were only Rs. 625 crores. There was a shortfall of Rs. 41·2 crores with the enhanced rates of taxation. I hope this fact will be considered, when the fresh Budget proposals are put up, that high rates of taxation have not brought about the necessary augmentation of revenues.

Progressive rates of taxation, I concede, afford a very sound principle of taxation in our country, solemnly pledged to eradicate and arrest enduring disparities in wealth, opportunities and power. But even in progressive taxation, a halt must be ordered when a point of no return is reached. We have left that point long behind and as a result today the incentive to work is at a great discount, reward for hard work is looked upon with discontentment if paid from the books of accounts. Beyond a certain point one does not want to show his ability and work harder. This state of affairs casts a gloom over the entire field of economic activity, for human beings are human beings and as so rightly pointed out by an eminent authority on taxation:

> "We harness the power in coal and oil in fall and stream, but the greatest of powers, the immeasurable reservoir of the people's faith and response energy and endeavour is left to channel off where it will."

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may conclude now.

Shri N. K. P. Salve: We have today a Finance Minister to whom everyone looks up with great expectation. In him we have a person who combines wisdom, power and courage. It is for him to take the country out of the morass into which it has sunk. If he does not do it, in a few years' time we would have irreparably imperilled the very foundations of democracy.

I am very grateful for your indulgence and your consideration. This is my maiden speech and for any lapses in it I seek your forgiveness. I look forward to participation in the deliberations of this sacred chamber, the highest temple of democracy in my country in its traditions of fearlessness with humility, scholarship with modesty, duty with sincerity and humour with dignity.

Shri P. C. Adichan (Adoor): Sir, I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to participate in the discussion on the Finance Bill. The country is at present passing through a serious economic crisis. The food situation has worsened further. One naturally thought the Hon'ble Finance Minister would have indicated some bold new directions towards solving the crisis, while introducing the interim budget. But unfortunately his budget speech and his reply to the budget debate did not spell out any such thing. On the other hand it has now become clear that the Congress and its government at the centre are bent upon pursuing the same old policy which have led the country to the present crisis. The economic policies pursued by the Congress in the past had only strengthened the Indian monopolists and had brought untold miseries to the common masses. The shameful policy of surrendering to the dictates of foreign monopolists would continue unabated. The recent decision of the Government to extend the deadline for fertiliser deals with foreign oil cartels has shown that the present government are not ashamed at all in continuing the sell out policies wihch they has been pursuing hitherto.

Under 20 years of Congress rule, the disparity in income has only widened. The rich became more rich and the poor became more poor. Wealth began to be concentrated more and more in a few hands. Scarcity of goods, sky rocketing prices of essential articles, and the increasingly heavy burden of taxes has made the life of the common people utterly miserable. Under fifteen years of planning unemployment has reached unprecedented heights. It is no wonder that these anti-people policies of the Congress have been completely rejected by the people in the Fourth General elections. The Congress has been reduced to a minority in a number of States. It could secure only 39 per cent of the votes polled in the elections. Today non-Congress governments have come into power in a majority of States. The Fourth General elections clearly showed the people's urge not only for a political change, but also for a change in the economic policies pursued by the government. This great urge of the people expressed unequivocally through the elections should be taken note of by the new government and the whole economic policies should be recast accordingly. This would demand a complete reversal of the anti-people pro-capitalist policies pursued at present. The policy of building capitalism under the guise of socialisms should be abandoned.

14.25 hrs.

[SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK *in the Chair*]

A policy aimed at furthering the interests of the masses and curbing the growth of monopoly should be accepted. The policy of raising resources by fleecing the common man through taxes should be given up. New sources for finding resources for the development of the economy should be found out. I would call upon the Government to come out boldly and takes steps to nationalise banging, general insurance and foreign trade of the country.

Sir, the Centre-State relations have assumed new dimensions as a result of the coming into existence of non-Congress governments in several States. The States should be given more autonomy. Their financial sources should be strengthened. Unfortunately, the attitude taken by the Finance Minister towards the non-Congress governments is quite unhelpful and disappointing. The Finance Minister has raised the bogey of overdrafts by the States. In the name of strengthening the economy and enforcing discipline, he has actually held out a threat to the States. He says that hereafter overdraft facilities would not be allowed to the States, and he has instructed the Reserve Bank to stop over-drafts to the States which do not clear their debts within a stipulated period. First of all, I should

point out that these overdrafts were drawn not by the present non-Congress governments but by the predecessor Congress governments. The Congress governments by their ruinous policies had squandered the States' finances and created the present financial troubles for these States. As a matter of fact, the non-Congress governments in the States are now left with practically empty coffers. There is no reason why non-Congress governments should be penalised for the past sins of the Congress governments. Secondly, why is it that the Congress government at the Centre which had allowed the State governments to freely resort to overdrafts from the Reserve Bank in the past has suddenly found out the evil of overdrafts. I should say that the newly dawned wisdom on overdrafts and the slogan of financial discipline are a subtle move on the part of the Finance Minister to strangulate the non-Congress governments financially. The Finance Minister has advised the States that instead of resorting to overdrafts, they should try to raise their resources through additional taxes. Now everybody knows that the scope for additional taxation in the States are very limited. Any attempt to impose additional burden on the people through taxation will be resented by the people. In short this advice comes to this: either tax the people and become unpopular or go bankrupt. This is not the attitude a Central Finance Minister should take towards the States especially in the changed political situation in the country. The fact that a number of non-Congress governments have come into existence should be recognised and there must be a proper redistribution of the available resources between the Centre and the States. The States should get financial aid from the Centre by way of grants. Those States which are in real financial difficulties should not be compelled to clear the overdrafts. The overdrafts drawn by the States like Kerala should be written off in view of the extremely difficult financial position of the States.

The whole question of Centre-State relations has to be examined in the light of the political changes that have taken place in the country with a view to strengthen States' autonomy within the federal frame work of our Constitution. I hope the Centre would set up a Commission or some such machinery to examine this problem with the cooperation of the States.

Sir, I now wish to refer briefly to the serious food situation in the country. It is a pity that 20 years of Congress rule and fifteen years of planning have failed to solve the food problem. Why is it that the country is not able to attain self-sufficiency in food? It was the wrong policies pursued by the Congress that were responsible for the present sorry state of affairs. Agriculture is the pivot of economic development in our country. It was clear that any attempt to improve agricultural production would fail in this country, unless radical agrarian reforms were introduced as a pre-requisite for agricultural advance. Unless the tillers of the soil were made the real owners of land, there would be no real incentive to produce more. "Land to the tiller" was accepted as the main plank of the agrarian reforms under Congress rule. But they never implemented this programme. In the contrary the Congress governments in the States had sabotaged their own declared programmes on agrarian reforms. It is unfortunate that this vital aspect of the agrarian problem has not been even mentioned by the Finance Minister in his speech, though he has stressed the emphasis on agricultural production.

The Congress government instead of trying to find a long term solution to the food problem through increased production by introducing radical land reforms and by giving material and financial help to the agriculturists, had gone in for massive import of food grains from USA under P L480. The strategy of fighting India's battle of food, with a massive import of American food grains has failed completely. It was pointed out that PL 480

[Shri P. C. Adichan]

foodgrains would help the country in stabilising food prices and also help in building up a bufferstock to meet any emergency situation. Today neither there is a buffer stock, nor there has been any decline in the rising price trend. Profiteers and hoarders are thriving on the misery of the people. The Finance Minister does not hold out any promise to end this shameful dependence on America for food. On the other hand he has indicated that this dependence would continue for the next several years. It is hightime this shameful PL 480 deal is done away with and earnest efforts are made to solve the problem by relying on our own strength.

Coming to the current crisis in food, I should say that the central government has failed to make use of the available stock in the country by introducing an effective system of procurement and proper distribution. Only complete state trading in foodgrains can solve the present crisis. Strict measures should be taken against profiteers and blackmarketeers.

Mr. Chairman: He should conclude now.

Shri P. C. Adichan: States like Kerala, West Bengal and Bihar are facing a serious food situation due to inadequate supply of food grains from the Centre. In this connection I wish to draw the attention of the Government and the House to the serious situation prevailing in Kerala. Kerala is highly deficit in food. For half the food requirements of the State, we have to depend on the Centre and surplus States like Andhra. Due to the inadequate supply from the Centre, the rationing system in Kerala had broken down several times in recent months. It should be pointed out here that we in Kerala have been getting only 6 ozs of rice per head per day, even though the people in several other parts of the country were getting 12 ozs and more. Even the present meagre ration could not be given regularly due to non-availability of stock. The Southern Food zone consisting of Kerala, Madras, Mysore and Andhra was abolished in 1964 and single state zone was introduced instead. Kerala was cordoned off as a deficit area. The Centre had then taken up the responsibility of meeting the food requirements of the State. But the Central government had failed to honour its commitments. It was the duty of the Central government to send adequate quantity of rice and other foodgrains to Kerala which is earning valuable foreign exchange for the Centre by exporting its cash crops. The scope for increasing food production in the State is limited. A considerable portion of the cultivable area in the State is under cash crops. If the cash crops are converted into food crops, the country will have to lose the foreign exchange which it is now getting through the export of cash crops. The Centre has to take note of this special aspect of the problem. Unfortunately, the Central government had been following a policy of discrimination against Kerala in all respects particularly in the matter of food supply. Recently the government withdrew the subsidy given to the State for the supply of rice. The State was asked to raise the price of rationed rice to make up the loss.

Mr. Chairman: He should conclude now.

Shri P. C. Adichan: Sir, I am a new member from Kerala. I will finish in two minutes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): It is his maiden speech, Sir.

Shri P. C. Adichan: Lastly, I want to refer to the crisis in the cashew industry of Kerala. I come from an area where the cashew industry is concentrated. In Kerala about one lakh people are employed in the cashew industry, of which 75 per cent are Harijans, especially women. It is mostly a seasonal industry. Due to non-availability of raw cashew nuts, the industry is not able to work to full capacity.

Several factories have been closed down and thousands of workers have been rendered unemployed. This is an important industry from the point of view of foreign exchange. The export of cashew kernels is earning a considerable amount of foreign exchange every year. The production of raw cashew nuts in the country is not sufficient to sustain the industry throughout the year. About 60 per cent of raw nuts are now imported from African countries at exorbitantly high price.

I would request the Government to set up a Cashew Board and Cashew Finance Corporation to develop the cashew industry on a sound basis.

(one sentence in Malyalam)

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (कन्नौज) : अभी प्रधान मंत्री महोदया ने जो बयान दिया है वह मुझको दे देंगे तो मुझको अपने भाषणों को आगे चलाने में आसानी होगी ।

सभापति महोदय : फ़ाइनेंस बिल पर आप बोल रहे हैं वह अभी आपको दे दिया जायगा ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक, एक पैसा मैं इस सरकार को देना अधर्म समझता हूं ।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : (गोपालगंज) : सभापति महोदय, एक निवेदन यह है कि यहां बराबर यह होता है कि एक उधर से बुलाया जाता है और एक इधर की ओर से बुलाया जाता है लेकिन आपने फिर उधर के ही आदमी को बुला लिया ।

सभापति महोदय : यह एक इधर से और एक उधर से ही बुलाना आवश्यक नहीं है बाक़ी दोनों को बुलाया जाता है ।

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) : अभी मैंने श्री पटनायक को प्रधान मंत्री महोदया के बयान की कापी के लिए कहा है, कृपया आप, उस स्टेटमेंट को मंगा दीजिये उसकी हमें ज़रूरत है ।

सभापति महोदय : वह दस, पांच मिनट में बोलते बोलते आ जायेगा । और मैं अभी श्री मनोहरन को बुला रहा हूं, आप को बाद में बुला लूंगा ।

Shri Manoharan (Madras North): Mr. Chairman, Sir, on behalf of my group, I want to draw the attention . . .

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma (Khammam): Cannot Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia influence Shri Manoharan to speak in Hindi or at least in Tamil?

श्री मधु लिमये : (मुंगेर) : तामिल में बोल सकते हैं इस में क्या है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अरे भाई मनोहरन, उस खबसूरत महिला लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा को खुश करो, तामिल में बोलो । *(Interruption)*.

Mr. Chairman: *Let him proceed.*

Shri Manoharan: Mr. Chairman, Sir, on behalf of my group, I want to draw the attention of this House to certain problems connected with the federal finance. In my previous speech, Mr. Chairman, while I spoke on the No-confidence Motion, I have brought to the notice of this House the relation between the Centre and State. My explanation then was purely political. Today I want to speak on the financial implications that may arise between the Centre and State.

Before entering into the subject proper, I want to define what we mean by federal government, what we mean by federalism. The authority on that, the authority on federal government, Mr. K. C. Wheare, has correctly pointed out:

> "The term federal government is used very loosely in political discussions and is seldom given the meaning which is at once clear and distinct."

[Shri Manoharan]

Then he says:

"The correct interpretation of the federal government according to me is this. To be sure most of those who use it agree in this that they have in mind an association of States which has been formed for certain common purposes but in which the member States retain a large measure of their original independence."

After the fourth general elections, I have pointed out, the composition of this House has changed and the complexion has also altered. The strength of the opposition has augmented. Logically speaking, therefore, the strength of the ruling party is reduced. Certain States have gone to the opposition; certain States have been still retained by the Congress Party. The new problem thereby created is to be faced with imagination and correct understanding by the leadership of the Central Government.

I am very proud of telling that throughout India Madras State, where DMK party rules, is a State which cleared the overdraft within a span of twenty days of the assumption of office. I think this aspect will attract the attention of our Finance Minister, because so many States have been accused by the Central Government saying that the States resorted to overdraft. Since the overdraft has been cleared by my government, I hope the overdraft problem will not cloud the correct thinking on the part of the Central Government. I do not think it is out of any pleasure that the State Governments resort to overdraft of this kind. What were the conditions created by the Central Government wherein the State Governments were compelled to resort to overdraft is to be considered by the Finance Minister of the Central Government.

My leader has very clearly stated that we do not want any interference from the Central Government, while we agree to what we call a federal system. I have already stated that the federalism that India has today suffers from want of correct thinking, because the federalism of India today has its unitary features too much and it has a sort of federal complexion which, according to me, is a will on the wisp. Therefore, the members of the DMK and the right thinking people of this country wish the present Constitution of this land should be re-examined and reapprised, especially in the light of the present developments that we face today.

So far as DMK is concerned, I want to make it clear that once upon a time we had been talking of secession. Separate independent Dravidanad was our slogan. But today I want to stress this point very clearly that we have given it up once and for all. We will never revive it. I request the hon. Finance Minister not to create conditions wherein this given up demand is unfortunately revived. It is not that an element of threat is being introduced.

Shri Morarji Desai: What else is it?

Shri Manoharan: When anybody or any association creates conditions wherein a party which had been speaking of secession and which had given up that demand is compelled to revive that demand, no nation, no right-thinking person of this country should tolerate that kind of association or individual, and if they tolerate that we cannot be blamed for our stand. It is not at all a threat; on the contrary, I request the hon. Finance Minister to appreciate and understand the real problems which States of this country are facing today.

We now, with a categorical declaration, say that we are not for total independence, nor for total dependence; on the contrary, we are for interdependence;. That is the present philosophy of the DMK and we will

never deviate from that line. This is the categorical assurance on behalf of my party that I am making.

My leader, Shri Annadurai, the Chief Minister of Madras, very clearly stated that the Centre should not stand in the way of the State Government's efforts to improve the lot of the people. He said that if Delhi did make any such attempt he would not hesitate to expose it. This statement of my leader has, unfortunately, been misunderstood by a certain section of this House. My leader has very clearly said at that time that though the DMK had given up its demand for Dravidanad it would continue to fight against what he termed "regional imbalance,.... and over-centralisation". It was to eliminate this—I want to stress it—that the demand was originally made, he said.

Therefore, even when we made this demand, our intention was not to cut the country into two or three parts but to get more power for the States. The States should not be made the chronic dependence of the Central Government. That is our view.

I think, here it is fitting to quote the ex-Chairman of the Finance Commission, Dr. Rajamannar. He has defined the federal principle like this:—

> "The Federal principle requires that the general and regional governments of a country shall be independent each of the other within their respective spheres and shall be not subordinate one to the other, but co-ordinate with each other. Now, if this principle is to operate in practice, both the general and regional governments must each have independent control of financial resources sufficient to perform their respective functions. It is, therefore, as necessary that the State Governments should be able to command the means of supplying their wants, as that the national government should possess the like faculty in respect to the wants of the Union' (Federalist)."

This Dr. Rajamannar has written in his report of the Finance Commission, 1965.

My point is this. We have got so many States in the Union. The States should be given more powers. The residuary powers that are to go to the States are not given to the States unfortunately; these powers are being enjoyed by the Central Government. Some inelastic taxes and duties have been thrown as a political crumb by the Central Government to the States. That creates a condition where the States have to depend upon the Central Government for anything and everything. This sort of humiliation should not be allowed to be tolerated in the general interest of the country.

I want to makt one more point clear. If the option is given to me whether I am for a strong government or for a strong nation, my preference would be for a strong nation rather than for a strong government. Strong government means totalitarian in its aspects; strong nation is a prime consideration for the right-thinking people of this country.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should try to conclude now.

Shri Manoharan: I have taken only five minutes, I think.

Mr. Chairman: You may have another two minutes.

Shri Manoharan: I want to say, particularly for the knowledge of the hon. Finance Minister, that this is not a new thing in the federal concept of any nation. It has been the raging problem wherever federal concept was accepted. For example, in America in the 18th Century the same problem cropped up. This problem had been there in its wider dimensions. Then, the then President of United States of America, Andrew Jackson, had to intervene. This problem was placed

[Shri Manoharan]

and projected by no less a person than the then Vice-President of America, Mr. Calhoun. He, in his State of South Carolina, protested strongly against certain financial measures taken and passed by the federal government which affected the financial resources of that particular State. Therefore Mr. Calhoun said, "We are not going to accept this thing." That sort of a situation led the South Carolina State to resort to the doctrine, called the Doctrine of Nullification. He said, "in the Federal Government, you have something, but so far as our Government is concerned, we are not going to accept it; we are going to declare it null and void." After that, Andrew Jackson had to intervene, and he intervened and got the matter rectified. That amount of understanding and imagination is necessary. I think the time will introduce that element of dynamism in the political thinking of our Finance Minister and the Central Government.

One more point. This Calhoun has very clearly stated this in his statement. I want to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to this particular fact because while I was saying, "it is not a threat, he asked me, after having given us the mind of the DMK, what else is it". Therefore, I want to draw his attention to this statement.

> "If a region cannot support itself, then it is entitled to be guaranteed in a federal Constitution access to sufficient resources under its own control to help it perform its functions. It is not enough to say that only those who can afford to pay for self-Government deserve to have it. The federal principle of equality of status between he regions which form the federal Union and between those regions and the General Government ensures when it is applied that each region, whatever its resources will be enabled to govern itself and regulate its life in its own way."

Mr. Chairman: He may conclude now.

Shri Manoharan: I am finishing. One more point.

This is the view expressed by the people of this country. I request the hon. Finance Minister to see that, as far as possible, the State Governments have their own way without infringing the general interests of this country. If that aspect is not heeded, what will happen? The frustrated units of the Indian Union may think in terms of step-motherly treatment given by the Central Government very seriously and that will, I think, threaten the very cordial atmosphere that is being created by the units of India as well as States.

Mr. Chairman: He may finish now.

Shri Manoharan: Lastly, in conclusion, I can say this, because you are rushing:

> "It is a part of wisdom to see and admit a fact so important and to take it into the estimate of measures and not to expect to prevent its natural consequences by overlooking its existence."

This point is my gift to the Finance Minister of this country and he must see—it is his lookout, I think— that the relations between the States and the Central Government are cordially maintained and established without any grouse from any quarter of this country, irrespective of the fact whether it is a non-Congress Government or a Congress Government.

सभापति महोदय : इस बिल को साढ़े तीन बजे तक चलना है। मंत्री महोदय, पन्द्रह बीस मिनट बोलेंगे। बहुत से माननीय सदस्य इस पर बोलना चाहते हैं। उनको

बहुत कम समय मिल सकेगा । पांच पांच मिनट अगर वे लें तो तीन चार माननीय सदस्य बोल सकते हैं । मैं प्रार्थना करता हूं कि पांच मिनट से अधिक समय कोई माननीय सदस्य न लें ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : हमारे लिये भी पांच मिनट ? यह तो नहीं हो सकेगा ।

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : सभापति महोदय, जो वित्त विधेयक पेश किया गया है इसका मैं स्वागत करता हूं । मैं वित्त मंत्री जी को एक बात से सावधान करना चाहता हूं । अभी जो चुनाव हुए हैं उसके नतीजे गलत तरीके से वर्णन कर धमकाने की कोशिशें हो रही हैं । सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को बुल्ली किया जा रहा है और कहा जा रहा है कि तुम इम्पार्शल नहीं हो और तुम कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट्स की ज्यादा फेवर करते हो बनिस्बत नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंटस, कि इस तरह सैंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को डरा कर नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट्स के लिए ये लोग ज्यादा फायदा उठा लेना चाहते हैं । मैं वित्त मंत्री को सावधान करना चाहता हूं कि जितनी भी हिन्दुस्तान में स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स हैं उनको वह एक परिवार समझें और हर एक के साथ एक सा बरताव करें, एक समान दृष्टि से उनको देखें और ऐसा न हो कि कोई कांग्रेस या नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट चूंकि सेंटर को बुल्ली कर सकती है, इसलिए उसको अधिक फायदा पहुंचा दिया जाए और जो गवर्नमेंट्स शान्त रहें उनकी अवहेलना कर दी जाए । मैं नहीं चाहता हूं कि किसी भी नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट के साथ किसी भी तरह का कोई डिसक्रिमिनेशन हो । सब के साथ चाहे वह कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट हो या नान-कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट, एक समान व्यवहार होना चाहिये ।

एक और बात कही जाती है और बहुत बार कही जाती है । वह यह है कि इलैक्टोरेट ने कांग्रेस को रिजैक्ट कर दिया है । यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है । मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि आज बीस वर्षों से कांग्रेस के हाथों में शासन सूत्र रहा है । कहीं भी संसार में कोई भी पार्टी जो अधिक दिन तक शासन में रहती है, कुछ उसकी तरफ लोगों की कटुता हो जाती है । एक बात हमने बराबर कही है कि एक स्ट्रांग अपोजीशन होनी चाहिये, अपोजीशन की संख्या कुछ अधिक होनी चाहिये । लोगों ने समझा कि हमको कुछ अपोजीशन के लोगों को अधिक संख्या में भेजना चाहिये । कहीं कहीं जनता में यह भावना इतनी अधिक हो गई और उससे यह गलती हो गई कि कुछ ज्यादा संख्या में उनने अपोजीशन के आदमियों को कुछ ज्यादा संख्या में चुन लिया । अन्यथा आप देखेंगे कि हर प्रान्त में कांग्रेस जनों की संख्या हर किसी दूसरी पार्टी के लोगों से अधिक है । आप बंगाल से लें । वहां पर जितने कांग्रेस के सदस्य चुन कर आए हैं उनके मुकाबले में आप एक किसी भी दल को ले लें तो मालूम पड़ेगा कि उतनी संख्या किसी की नहीं है । जब सतरह-सतरह दल मिल कर काम करते हैं तब उनमें शायद कांग्रेस से अधिक बढ़ जाने की बात हो जाती है, तब उनकी संख्या कांग्रेस के सदस्यों की संख्या से अधिक हो जाती है । बिहार में आप आइये, उत्तर प्रदेश में आइये, राजस्थान में आइये, कहीं भी आप जाइये आपको पता चलेगा कि कांग्रेसी सदस्यों की संख्या किसी भी एक दल के सदस्यों से कहीं ज्यादा है ।

Shri S. Kandappan (Mettur): On a point of order, What are we discussing now?

Mr. Chairman: There is no point of order. Please let the hon. Member continue.

Shri S. K. Sambandhan (Tiruthani): It should have some relevance.

श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी : मैं मान सकता हूं कि दो स्टेट्स, मद्रास और केरल ऐसी हैं जहां पर कांग्रेस की तरफ लोगों का आक्

[श्री द्वा० ना० तिवारी]

कम हुआ है और विरोधी दलों को लोगों ने चुना है। लेकिन वोटों की संख्या आप देखेंगे तो आपको पता चलेगा कि संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी या कोई दूसरी पार्टी को जितने परसेंट वोट मिले हैं, वे कांग्रेस को मिले वोटों के एक चौथाई भी नहीं हैं। हां सभी विरोधी दलों को संयुक्त कर लीजिये, तो उनके वोट अधिक हो सकते हैं।

अब मैं रिजनल इम्बैलेंस के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर का दृष्टिकोण यह होना चाहिए कि जो इलाका बहुत गिरा हुआ है, बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ है, बहुत गरीब है, उसको पहले तरजीह दी जाए। मैं जानता हूं कि आप मुझे अधिक समय नहीं देंगे। इस वास्ते मैं फैक्ट्स एंड फिगर्ज आपके सामने नहीं रख सकता। लेकिन मैं बतलाना चाहता हूं कि कुछ इलाके हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे हैं जहां पर प्रति व्यक्ति सालाना आमदनी सौ रुपये से भी कम है और दूसरी ओर कुछ इलाके ऐसे हैं जहां पर प्रति व्यक्ति सालाना आमदनी चार सौ रुपये से भी अधिक है। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक समृद्ध इलाके में जितना तवज्जह होता है दूसरे इलाके में जो पिछड़ा हुआ है उस में भी उतना ही तवज्जह हो। उनको देखना चाहिये कि किस प्रान्त में किस हद तक लोग पिछड़े हुए हैं उस प्रान्त में कितनी गरीबी है। वित्त मंत्री जी को ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि जहां सब से अधिक गरीबी हो वहां उनकी तवज्जह पहले जाए, उसका उत्थान पहले करने का प्रयत्न उनकी ओर से होना चाहिये और उसके बाद जो लोग मजबूत हैं, जो आज भी अच्छे हैं, उनकी तरफ उनकी तवज्जह जानी चाहिये। इस तरह से अगर कार्य हुआ तो रिजनल इम्बैलेंस दूर हो सकता है। इसके विपरीत अगर सभी इलाकों को बराबर पैसा मिले जो गरीब हैं उनको भी उतना ही मिले जितना कि जो आगे बढ़े हुए हैं उनको मिलता है तो यह इम्बैलेंस को दूर करने का तरीका कभी नहीं हो सकता है। यह तभी हो सकता है, यह इम्बैलेंस तभी दूर हो सकता है जब कमजोर को ज्यादा मजबूत बनाने की कोशिश की जाए और जो मजबूत है, वह कमजोर न हो, इसकी कोशिश की जाए। मैं वित्त मंत्री का ध्यान ऐसी रिपोर्ट्स में आर्थिक ब्योरा कि किस इलाके में क्या हालत है, किस इलाके की जनता कितनी पीछे है और कितनी उसकी आर्थिक दशा खराब है, की ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं। उन सब को ध्यान में रखते हुए उनको अपनी आर्थिक नीति बनानी चाहिये।

15 hrs.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सभापति महोदय, आज मुझे बहुत बुरी बुरी बातें कहनी हैं। लेकिन उससे पहले मैं एक अच्छी बात कह दूं नमक कर हटाये जाने के बारे में। मेरे पिता हीरालाल जी उन दो सौ सत्याग्रहियों में से थे, जिन्होंने धारासाना के नमक डिपो पर हमला किया था बिल्कुल निःशस्त्र हो कर। मुट्ठी से नमक में लिया। मूर्च्छित हो गए, लेकिन नमक नहीं छोड़ा। आज मुझे खुशी है कि वह नमक कर जिसके लिए इतनी बड़ी लड़ाई हुई थी, जहां तक मैं समझ पाया हूं, खत्म हो रहा है।

इस के साथ साथ मैं एक खुशखबरी इस सदन को सुनाना चाहता हूं। महात्मा गांधी का अभी तक फ्रांस में कोई खास सम्मान नहीं था। रोमन रोलां जैसे इक्के-दुक्के लेखक कुछ लिख दिया करते थे। "रियालिते" नाम की फ्रांसीसी पत्रिका में बड़े बड़े फ्रांसीसी राजकीय पुरुषों का मत निकला है। जिन के बारे में मत निकला है, उन में कार्ल मार्क्स, वोल्तेयर और लेनिन शामिल है। फ्रांस के विरोधी दल के नेता फ्रांसोआ मितेरां और फ्रांस के प्रधान मंत्री प्रो० पाम्पीदो इन दोनों ने अपनी यह राय जाहिर की है कि

महात्मा गांधी ने उस के विचार पर सब से ज्यादा असर डाला है । यह खुशी की बात मैं सदन को बता देना चाहता हूं और उसी की पृष्ठभूमि में कुछ कहना चाहता हूं ।

कहां महात्मा गांधी और कहां ये लोग ! मैं कोशिश कर रहा हूं कि मैं थोड़ा बहुत उनके रास्ते पर चलूं । न जाने किस चालाकी से वित्त मंत्री जी ने भी यह अफ़वाह फैला दी है कि वह भी उस रास्ते पर चल रहे हैं ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : मैंने कुछ नहीं फैलाया है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सब से बड़ी बात तो यह है कि जो अविलम्बनीयता, जो तात्कालिकता फ़ौरन करो बिना सोचे करो—सोच बहुत लिया है— आदतन करो यह जो भावना हमें अपने काम में रखनी चाहिये आज वह नहीं है । मिसाल के लिए आप युद्ध-कोष को लीजिए । चीन से लड़ाई हुई । इस सरकार ने देश में आपत्काल की घोषणा की । इस सरकार के संसद् सदस्यों ने कानून बनाया । इस सरकार ने पैसा जमा करना चाहा । लेकिन मैं आज आपको एक खबर सुनाता हूं कि इस सरकार के पक्ष से—मैं मंत्रियों के बारे में नहीं जानता हूं कि कोई देता रहा है या नहीं—एक भी आदमी नहीं जिसने अपनी तनख्वाह के अंश को युद्ध-कोष में दिया । (व्यवधान)

एक माननीय सदस्य : दिया है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : नहीं दिया है । एक भी आदमी नहीं है । मैंने दफ़्तर में पूछा है । (व्यवधान) मुझे कहने दीजिये । ये बिल्कुल गलत बात बोल रहे हैं । आज इस सदन में उस पक्ष का एक भी आदमी नहीं है जिसने युद्ध-कोष में दिया हो । (व्यवधान)

श्री एस० के० पी० सालवे : मेरा एक अहम व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरी बात खत्म होने पर ही यह व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठा सकते हैं ।

श्री एन० के० पी० सालवे : माननीय सदस्य का भाषण खत्म होने पर ही अगर मुझे व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाने दिया गया तो उसकी अहमियत नहीं रहेगी ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अधूरे वाक्य में व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठाया जा सकता है ।

15.0 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

श्री एन० के० पी० सालवे : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अधूरे वाक्य में व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं उठाया जा सकता हैं । पहले मेरा वाक्य पूरा होना चाहिए ।

श्री एन० के० पी० सालवे : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि .....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let him finish his sentence. I will give him permission after that.

Dr. Sushila Nayar (Jhansi): A point of order takes precedence over everything else.

एक माननीय सदस्य : उन का सेन्टेन्स कम्पलीट हो चुका है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : सरकारी पक्ष के जितने भी पुराने लोक सभा के सदस्य हैं, जो इस लोक सभा में चुन कर आए हैं, जो विरोधी नहीं है, उन में एक आदमी भी नहीं है, जो युद्ध-कोष में पैसा दे रहा है ।

श्री के० एन० तिवारी (बेतिया) : सभी ने दिया है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक भी आदमी नहीं है । मैं ऐसे ही नहीं बोल रहा हूं । आप दफ़्तर से पूछ लीजिए ।

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

विरोधी दलों में एक आदमी है, जो दे रहा है। यह मेरा वाक्य है।

श्री एन० के० पी० सालवे : मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। फिनांस बिल को डीबेट करने के लिए बहुत थोड़ा सा टाइम दिया गया है। फिनांस बिल का स्कोप बहुत सीमित है। इस में लिखा है :

> "THE FINANCE BILL, 1967 —A BILL to continue for the financial year 1967-68 the existing rates of income-tax with certain modifications and the existing rates of annuity deposists and to provide for the continuance of certain commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the discontinuance of the duty on salt for the said year."

I also draw your attention to rule 75(1) which says:

> "On the day on which any motion referred to in rule 74 is made, or on any subsequent day to which the discussion thereof is postponed, the principle of the Bill and its provisions may be discussed generally . . ."

Shri Morarji Desai: May I tell my hon. friend that on the Budget, the Finance Bill and the President's Address, the sky is the limit for the discussion?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आज मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि मैं ने महात्मा गांधी की बात सुना कर श्री मोरार देसाई को खुश कर दिया है, उन का दिल छू लिया है।

श्री के० एन० तिवारी : हम लोगों को दुख हो रहा है कि माननीय सदस्य गलत बात कह रहे हैं।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा होता कि मैं इन का दिल भी छू पाता। मैं इस वक्त की बात कह रहा हूं। इस वक्त सरकार के पक्ष में एक भी आदमी नहीं है, जो दे रहा है, जबकि इधर से एक दे रहा है।

श्री नरेन्द्रसिंह महीड़ा (आनन्द) : कौन है ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कौन है, यह जान कर क्या करेंगे ? आवश्यकता है अविलम्बनीयता और तात्कालिता की, फौरन करो, आदतन करो, बिना सोचे करो, इस भावना की। जिस तरह से शायद आप लोग सुबह गणेश महाराज और लक्ष्मी को फूल चढ़ाने जाते होंगे, उसी तरह से युद्ध-कोष में अपनी तन्खवाह का एक हिस्सा दो, बिना सोचे दो।

श्री के० एन० तिवारी : दिया है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आज देने वाला एक भी नहीं है।

इस समय अकाल है, लोग भूखों मर रहे हैं। अकाल और भूख की पृष्ठभूमि में मैं केवल इस सरकार के बारे में ही नहीं, जिन सरकारों से मेरा दल जुड़ा हुआ है, उन के बारे में भी कहना चाहता हूं कि अभी तक न तो इस सरकार ने और न उन सरकारों ने इस तात्कालिता के गुण को समझा है।

इसी सन्दर्भ में मैं पंजाब के बारे में कह देना चाहता हूं। उधर से लोग हल्ला मचाते हैं। मैं भी उन के साथ हल्ला मचाना चाहता हूं। लोकतंत्र को अगर जिन्दा रखना चाहते हैं, तो कभी, किसी हालत में, विधान सभा से भागना नहीं चाहिए, चाहे कुछ भी अवस्था आ जाये। विधान सभा से भाग कर पंजाब की सरकार ने, जो किसी हद तक मेरी पार्टी से भी

जुड़ी हुई सरकार है, बुरा काम किया है— यह अच्छा नहीं किया है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: A little while earlier you said that under some rule we should adjourn the House. That was running away from responsibility.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : उस का तो सुबूत प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दे दिया है। मैं अभी इस पर आ रहा हूं कि क्यों इस सदन को बैठने की जरूरत नहीं है।

इस समय खाली यह सोचना चाहिए कि अगर अकाल से मोर्चा लेना है, तो फौरन, तत्काल, बिना एक क्षण की देर किये हुए कुछ काम होने चाहिएं : एक, लगान फौरन खत्म कर देना चाहिए; दो, सिंचाई का पानी हर जमीन को हर तरह से मिलना चाहिए, चाहे बिजली के कुएं खोद कर, चाहे कच्चे कुए खोद कर, चाहे गंगा, यमुना और कावेरी से पानी खींच कर और चाहे नाखून से मिट्टी खोद कर, पानी हर हालत में जमीन को मिलना चाहिए; तीन, करोड़ों नहीं तो लाखों टन तादाद में चार छः आठ हफ्ते की फसलों को उगाने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। यह तात्कालिकता उस तरफ नहीं है। मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इस तरफ भी जिस मात्रा में होनी चाहिए, उस मात्रा में नहीं है।

इस सम्बन्ध में एक बड़ी दिलचस्प बात उस खानदान की भी कहना चाहता हूं, जिस ने इस सारे देश को खरीद रखा है और किसी हद तक मंत्रि-मंडलों और मंत्रियों को भी। वह बिड़ला खानदान है।

श्री पी० एल० बारूपाल (गंगानगर) : वह तो आप का ही साथी है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: तो उसी बिरला खानदान ने जिसने कपड़ा शक्कर और अनेक चीजों के द्वारा भारत की करोड़ों जनता का खून चूसा है, अपने अखबारों के द्वारा लोगों के दिमाग में जहर भरा है उसको बड़ा घमंड रहा है, आज भी घमंड है इतना घमंड है कि मैंने सुन रखा है उसने अपने सौ आदमी एक तल्ले या दो तल्ले में रख छोड़ा है जो इस सरकार के यहां बड़ी बड़ी अफसरी करने के बाद छूट कर जाते हैं। उनका कोई काम धन्धा नहीं है। उनका खाली यह धन्धा है कि किस तरह से इस सरकार को बेईमान बनाया जाय किस तरह से उसको घूस दी जाय . . .

श्री विभूति मिश्र (मोतिहारी): उसकी सर्विस में तो किसी जमाने में आप भी थे।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं ? शायद यह लोग . . (व्यवधान) . . यह लोग हमेशा इस बात का ध्यान दिया करते हैं कि वह मारवाड़ी है और मैं भी मारवाड़ी हूं। तो मिश्र जी, याद करना मारवाड़ियों में 98 प्रतिशत गरीब हैं जैसे सारे देश में 98 प्रतिशत गरीब हैं और यह भी याद रखना कि मारवाड़ियों का रिश्तेदार मैं नहीं, यह सेठ जो बिरला है उसके रिश्तेदार आप और आपके प्रधान मंत्री हैं। जब यह अमेरिका गई थीं तो इनका मार्ग प्रशस्त करने के लिये बिरला ने दस से पन्द्रह लाख रुपया खर्च किया था जिसमें कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गान्धी को अमेरिका के लोग बड़े चाव से देखें, निहारें, जतन से देखें, जतन से निहारें। यह वह बिरला खानदान है। बड़ा घमंड इसको हो गया था। बड़ा घमंड हो गया है इन लोगों को, राजाओं और सेठों ने इस खानदान को, जिस तरह से सारे देश को इन्होंने बरबाद कर रखा है जिस का कि एक प्रमाण अभी अभी प्रधान मंत्री दे गईं। आज यह सभा खत्म होने वाली है। विशेषाधिकार का प्रश्न आ नहीं सकता। यह खत्म होना है। . . . **(व्यवधान)** . . . कभी कहते हैं एक हफ्ते में दे दीजिये। इसी सदन में, इसी सदन में 18 मार्च, 1967 को यानी आज से 20 दिन पहले प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने कहा कि जो हार सऊदी अरब के राजा ने उनको दिया था वह फौरन रिजर्व बैंक को भेज दिया गया.

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

20 दिन पहले । आज क्या कह रही हैं ? आज कह रही हैं कि सऊदी अरब के राजा ने उनको हार नवम्बर दिसम्बर 1955 में दिया था और वह 3 अप्रैल, 1958 को रिजर्व बैंक में भेजा गया । 55 में दिया गया, 58 में भेजा गया । तीन वर्ष कहां लटकता रह गया वह हार ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : गले में ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : किस के गले में लटकता रह गया वह हार तीन वर्ष तक ? यह सब कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि मेरे कब्जे में नहीं था । किसके कब्जे में था । इस तोशखाना के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता जानना चाहती है कि आखिर है क्या यह चीज ? क्या कुआं है ? उसमें कितने हार हैं ? कितने मोती हैं ? कितने मिंक हैं ? यह क्या खजाना पड़ा हुआ है ? क्यों नहीं उस तोशेखाने के बारे में कोई नियम बनाये जायें कि उसका सब पैसा निकल सके और सिचाई के, पानी के, काम में लाया जाय . . .

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Would it be proper to refer to events that happened when a person was not in a position of authority or responsibility? They are events in no way connected with the present position of the person. Would it be proper? As Dr. Karni Singh said earlier, you tried to rake up the past of every one here.

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav: What is Dr. Karni Singh? Is he the authority here?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा, अब अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप कह चुके । आपने अपना काम पूरा कर दिया । अब मैं आगे चलूं । यह ठीक है । क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री जी की वह लड़की थीं नम्बर एक और नम्बर दो आज के तौर पर प्रधान मंत्री जी के अतिथियों की मजबान थीं । तो उनका एक रुतबा था ।

और मोरारजी देसाई साहब, आप भी बच नहीं सकेंगे हो । इस सारे मंत्रीमंडल में मुझे बहुत दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है एक आदमी नहीं है कि जिस के बारे में मैं कह सकूं कि वह या उस के रिश्तेदारों ने पिछले बीस वर्षों में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को लूटा न हो । यह एक नहीं है । यहां पर पचास दफे पूछा गया । प्रधान मन्त्री जी कहती हैं तोशाखाना । आखिर वह कौन सा तोशाखाना है ? कौन सा बड़ा भारी ज्ञानवापी का कुआं है ? और उसके अलावा हीरे, एक नहीं है मामला यह । हीरे की डलियों का मामला है । खुले हीरे हैं । महीनों बाद दिए जाते हैं । मिंक का मामला है । मैं नहीं उठाता हूं । प्रधान मन्त्री जी खुद कहती हैं कि उन के पास नहीं था मिंक का, उन के पास सैबल है । सवाल उठता है कैसे मिला ? कहां से मिला ? फिर विदेशी मुद्रा के नियम बने हुए हैं अगर परदेश में कोई भी बहुमूल्य चीज खरीदता है और मिंक कोट बड़ा रही हो तो 40 हजार रुपये का होता है और अच्छा हो तो 6 लाख रुपये का होता है । होता है बढ़िया । सर्दियों के दिनों में इस के रोयें सफेद हो जाते हैं और गर्मी के दिनों में काले । क्या लाजवाब होता है ? अब यह सवाल है उस विदेशी मुद्रा से खरीदने के लिए कब अनुमति मिली कैसे मिली, किस लिए मिली ? अगर यहां खरीदा गया या किसी परदेशी ने खरीदकर दिया या उस से खरीदा गया तो कस्टम की अनुमति कब मिली ? इस सवाल से अब भागा नहीं जा सकता है । लोग मुझ से पूछते हैं कि भूख की बहस चलाओ, इस की मत चलाओ । भूख की बहस जितनी मैं ने चलाई है अनाज अन्न संहिता तीन छटांक चार छटांक, तीन आने पन्द्रह आने, कौन चलायेगा ? क्योंकि यह दोनों जुड़े हुए हैं । जब कोई सरकार देश सम्पति संचय और विलास वासना के रास्ते पर चल जाता है तब भूख को वह मिटा नहीं

सकता। भूख को वही मिटा सकता है जो सत्यवादी बने और सम्पत्ति संचय को छोड़ दे। इसलिए जो कुछ भी अभी यहां प्रस्ताव रखा है श्री देसाई ने, सब से पहली बात उठती है, यह सरकार तो अब नहीं सीख पायेगी .. (व्यवधान) ... बस, अब एक दो मिनट और दे दीजिए, मैं खत्म करता हूं।

सत्यावादिता और सम्पत्ति का संचय न करना यह नहीं सीख पायेंगे। अब अगर उधर कुछ लोग ऐसे हों जिनको मेरी बात जंच रही हो वही राधा स्वामी, वही महात्मा गांधी की बात, तो मैं एक बात कहूंगा। हम विरोधी दल के लोग--हम निकम्मे हैं, मैं बहुत निकम्मा हूं कितना निकम्मा हूं आप जानते नहीं हो विभूति मिश्र जी, मैं जानता हूं मैं ने चोर को हाथ में पकड़ लिया फिर भी मेरे हाथ कितने निर्बल हैं कि उन हाथों से वह छूटकर भाग गया। आप समझते हैं मैं सुखी हूं। सुखी नहीं हूं। लेकिन आप को याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हम विरोधी दल के लोग निकम्मे होते हुए भी एक आश्वासन देना चाहते हैं, आप के खाली 30 आदमी अगर इधर चले आयेंगे, खाली 30 आदमी, कोई मध्यावधि चुनाव करने की जरूरत नहीं है, प्रधान मन्त्री जी बहुत घबरायी हुई हैं, हमको क्या जरूरत पड़ी है मध्य वधि चुनाव करने की हमको तो यहीं आती है, 30 आदमी इधर चले आये यदि तो आज वह विरोधी इकट्ठे नहीं हो रहे हैं मेरे कुछ भी कहने से इकट्ठे नहीं होंगे लेकिन जिस दिन कुर्सी उन के सामने नहीं, उन के नीचे मैं रख दूंगा--आइए महाराज, बैठिए उस दिन ये सब इकट्ठा हो जायगे। सब इकट्ठा हो जायेंगे। आज नहीं इकट्ठा हो रहे हैं। कुर्सी रखने की जरूरत है। तो खाली 30 आदमी उधर के चले आवें, सब इकट्ठा हो जायेंगे और फिर ठाट के साथ वह सरकार शायद चला सकेंगे। और उसके पहले एक और जरूरी काम के लिए कहता हूं। मैं बहुत मामूली आदमी हूं। मैं नेता नहीं हूं किसी चीज का, शायद कभी नहीं बन पाऊंगा लेकिन हमारे दो नेता यहां बठे हुए हैं। एक हैं अन्ना जोशी और दूसरे हैं सुरेन्द्रनाथ द्विवेदी साहब। जरा 30 आदमी इधर चले आवें, उसके शायद पांच मिनट पहले तक यह दोनों ऐसे मिलकर एक पार्टी बना डालेंगे। मैं इन से प्रेम-पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूं कि और लोग इकट्ठे हों या न हों, कम से कम आप दोनों एक पार्टी हो जाय और इस के साथ साथ बंगला कांग्रेस, जन कांग्रेस और जनक्रान्ति दल, जितने ये लोग हैं इन सबसे कहता हूं --मत अलग रहो इकट्ठे हो जाओ। मेरी ये सब बातें अगर आप मे से किसी को पसन्द आई हों, तो जब 30 आदमी इधर चले आयेंगे तो मेरा काम सहल हो जायेगा। राम सुभग सिंह आप ही 29 कर दो उस नम्बर को।

श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह (वाराणसी) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके सामने इस बिल के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूं। पहली बात मैं आपके सामने यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यह बिल उस समय सदन के सामने पेश किया गया है, जब कि हिन्दुस्तान में आर्थिक संकट बहुत गहरा छाया हुआ है। हम आज अपनी आखों के सामने इस बात का सबूत देख रहे हैं कि सारा हिन्दुस्तान इस गहरे संकट की लहरों में चक्कर काट रहा है। हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि आज विदेशी मुद्रा का संकट छाया हुआ है, हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि योजनाओं का संकट आज हमारे सिर पर मंडरा रहा है। हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि खाद्य संकट आज इतनी ऊंचाई पर पहुंचा हुआ है कि जितना हिन्दुस्तान की पिछली 18-20 साल की जिन्दगी में कभी भी देखने को नहीं मिला था। इस लिये आज हम देख रहे हैं कि पूरे हिन्दुस्तान का आर्थिक ढांचा चरमरा कर टूट रहा है। ऐसी स्थिति में यह जो बिल लाया गया है, हम ने समझा था कि इस के अन्दर कुछ ऐसे संकेत दिखाई

[श्री सत्यनारायण सिंह]

पड़ेंगे कि जिन से हम यह समझेंगे कि कोशिश करने से शायद संकट से निकलने की कोई आशा दिखाई पड़ेगी, लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज कोई भी ऐसा संकेत नहीं है। बल्कि इस के देखने से संकेत मिलता है कि आने वाल जमाने में यह संकट अधिक व्यापक और गहरा होता जायगा हिन्दुस्तान को गुलामी की बुनियाद की तरफ बांधने के लिये ले जायगा।

हम साफ कहना चाहते हैं—थोड़े दिन पहले हम से कहा गया था, मुल्क की जनता से कहा गया था कि जब रुपये का अवमूल्यन होगा तो चीजों के दाम नहीं बढ़ेंगे, हमारा निर्यात बढ़ेगा जिससे कि हमारी आमदनी बढ़ेगी। लेकिन आज आप इस बात को देखने की कोशिश करें— यह हिन्दुस्तान की जिन्दगी की सच्चाई है, मैं नहीं बोल रहा हूं- चीजों के दाम कितने आग बढ़ चुके हैं, आयात घट गया है और हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय खुद अपनी तकरीर में इस बात को कबूल किया है कि 9 फीसदी हमारा पहले से निर्यात गिर गया है। ऐसी हालत में आप यह देखने की कोशिश करें कि जितने उस तरफ बैठने वाले हमारे मित्र हैं— मोटी, मोटी और बड़ी बड़ी बातें करते हैं, जनता के सामने बड़े बड़े वायदे करते हैं, लेकिन उसके ठीक उलट इन का जीवन चलता है, इन की कथनी और करनी में, इनके सिद्धान्तो में, इन के कामों में कोई एकता 20 साल के जमाने में दिखाई नहीं पड़ी। यह कहते कुछ हैं, लेकिन अमल कुछ और करते हैं।

15: 22 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

पिछली बार जब लोक सभा बैठी और लोक सभा में प्रश्न उठाये गये कि क्या आप रुपये का अवमूल्यन करना चाहते हैं तो सरकार ने जवाब दिया—नहीं। लेकिन जब यह पालियामेन्ट स्थगित हुई, तब घोषणा कर दी गई कि रुपये की कीमत गिरा दी गई है। क्या रुपये का अवमूल्यन करके हिन्दुस्तान की प्रतिष्ठा को, हिन्दुस्तान के गौरव को दुनिया के सामने गिराया नहीं गया? क्या उस के जरिये हिन्दुस्तान को सारी दुनिया के सामने भिखारी बना कर नहीं खड़ा कर दिया गया— कि दुनिया का सब से बड़ा भिखारी मुल्क अगर कोई है, तो हिन्दुस्तान है। रुपये का अवमूल्यन कर के आपने हिन्दुस्तान की शान को गिराया है।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं- हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने वायदा किया था कि टैक्स नहीं बढ़ाये जायेंगे और हमारे आर्थिक जीवन में जो अस्थिरता दिखाई पड़ रही है, इस में स्थिरता लाई जायेगी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं आपके जरिये से कि कौनसा संकेत इस बजट में वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने रखा है कि जिस से हम को इस बात का लक्षण दिखाई पड़े कि आनेवाले जमाने में हमारे इस देश को इस संकट से निकालने का कोई कदम आप उठा सकेंगे। हम आपसे पूछना चाहते है कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार में रुपये का अवमूल्यन हो जाने के बाद हमारी चीजें जो आज बाहर भेजी जाती हैं, क्या उनकी कीमत, उन के दाम, कम नहीं मिल रहे हैं, क्या जो चीजें अपने जीवन की आज हम बाहर से मंगा रहे हैं, उन के दाम ज्यादा नहीं देने पड़ रहे हैं, यदि देने पड़ रहे हैं तो इस से जो घाटा होने वाला है, इस से जो आमदनी गिरने वाली है, उस की पूर्ति कहां से होगी?

आज गल्ले का आयात हमारे मुल्क में बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ गया है, जिसकी वजह से दूसरी जो जीवन की उपयोगी वस्तुएं हम बाहर से मंगाते थे और उस से जो आमदनी होती थी, उस में भी हम को घाटा होगा, आप किस तरह से इस को पूरा करेंगे, यह बताने की कोशिश करें। हम

आप से कहना चाहते हैं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश के अन्दर जो आर्थिक नीति चलाई गई है वह कौन सी नीति है—वह ऐसी नीति है जो कि हिन्दुस्तान को पूंजीवादी रास्ते पर ले जा रहा है, जो इस देश को पूंजीवादी देश बनाने की नीति है, जिस से हमारे देश की आर्थिक व्यवस्था तहस-नहस और बरबाद हो रही है। हम अपील करना चाहते हैं इस हाउस से—हमारे वित्त मंत्री ने कहा है कि इस बिल को सब का समर्थन मिले—तो हम इस हाउस से और अपने उधर के दोस्तों से अपील करना चाहते है कि जिन्दगी सब से बड़ी शिक्षक होती है, 20 साल की जिन्दगी में हिन्दुस्तान में जो कुछ हो रहा है, खेती-खलिहानों में जो कुछ हो रहा है, उससे कुछ सीखे हो या नहीं, हिन्दुस्तान के रुपयें का अवमूल्यन कर के आज देश के सम्मान को तुमने गिराया है, इस से कुछ सीखे हो या नहीं ? अगर नहीं सीखोगे तो कब सीखोगे। हम आप से अपील करना चाहते हैं कि हम और आप दोनों इस देश को बनाने वाले हैं, उधर बैठने वाले या इधर बैठने वाले दोनों देश को बनाने वाले हैं—आइये, जैसा डाक्टर साहब ने कहा, 30 आदमी इधर आजांय, तो देश में एक ऐसी सरकार बनायें, जो कि इस नीति के खिलाफ जनता के पक्ष में काम करने वाली नीति को चला सकें, इस देश को इस संकट से बचा सकें और देश की आजादी को सुदृढ़ आधार पर खड़ा किया जा सके तथा देश के गिरते हुए सम्मान को बचाया जा सके।

श्री मोहन स्वरूप (पीलीभीत) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, उर्दू का एक शेर है—

उन को देखे से जो आ जाती है चेहरे पे हंसी,
वह समझते हैं कि बीमार का हाल अच्छा है।

गवर्नमेंन्ट के 20 सालों के कामों से आज हालत यह है कि गरीबी बढ़ती जा रही है, किसान दुखी है, साथ ही साथ मजदूर भी दुखी हैं। क्योंकि आज हालत यह है कि डेढ़ रुपये किलो आटा मिल रहा है, जब कि मजदूर की मजदूरी भी डेढ़ या दो रुपये है। वैसी स्थिति में वह किस तरह से जिन्दगी बसर कर सकेगा, किस तरह से आम आदमी गुजारा कर सकेंगे,, यह मुश्किल नजर आ रहा है। गवर्नमेंट की जो फाइनेन्शल हालत रही है, जो नीति वित्त सम्बन्धी रही है, वह हमेशा दोषपूर्ण रही है। हम हमेशा बड़ी एम्बीशश प्लान्ज बनाते रहे हैं, अभी चौथा प्लान भी काफी एम्बीशश है—उस में प्रावधान है 23,750 करोड़ रुपये का, जिस में से 16,000 करोड़ रुपया पब्लिक सैक्टर में सर्फ होगा और इसी तरह से खेती के लिए भी वहां बड़ा प्रोग्राम है—तो इस तरह से बहुत एम्बीशश प्लान बनाते हैं, लेकिन जब उन को पूरा करने की नौबत आती है तो डेफिसिट फाइनेन्सिंग, बोरोइंग और टैक्सेशन की शरण लेनी पड़ती है। अभी डेफिसिट फाइनेन्सिंग की हालत यह रही है—फर्स्ट प्लान में 330 करोड़ रुपये डेफिसिट फाइनेन्सिंग रहा, सैकण्ड प्लान में 954 करोड़ रुपये हो गया, तीसरे प्लान में 1150 करोड़ रुपये हैं और कुछ लोगों का अनुमान है कि 1400 करोड़ रुपये तक हो गया है।

इसी तरीके से बोरोइंग को जो हालत है, कर्ज लेने की जो हालत है वह भी बड़ी खराब है। 1961 में 761 करोड़ रुपया हुआ जबकि सन् 1966 में 2629 करोड़ रुपया हो गया और नतीजा यह है कि भारत-वर्ष आज दुनिया के सब से बड़े मकरूज देशों में शुमार होता है। अभी भी हम इसी पर आधारित है कि अपनी चतुर्थ पंच-वर्षीय योजना यह जो आने वाला साल है उस में भी हम बाहर से ही रुपया लें लेकिन अभी अभी ऐड इंडिया कंसोर्टियम से बहुत बड़ी संख्या में रुपये का वायदा हुआ है। पता नहीं किस तरीके से पूरा होगा ? इस तरीके से डेफिसिट फाइनेंसिंग के द्वारा हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता है। अभी भी 50 करोड़ रुपये का घाटा दिखलाया गया है। इस बजट में पहले कई बार इस

[श्री मोहन स्वरूप]

तरफ से कहा गया और वित्त मंत्री ने और गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से भी कहा गया कि डैफ़िसिट फाइनेंसिंग को जितना होगा हम रोकेंगे लेकिन वह प्रवृति बराबर जारी है और मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि डैफ़िसिट फाइनैंसिंग के बल पर हमारे देश का जो वित्तीय स्थिति है उस को नहीं सुधार सकेंगे।

मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि नैशनल इनकम भी हमारी गिरती जा रही है और वह सन् 1965-66 में 4 परसेंट गिर गई है। हमारी पर कैपिटा नेशनल इनकम का भी यही हाल है। इसी पृष्ठभूमि में हमने डीवैलएशन का भी काम किया। जो सब से ज्यादा दुखःपूर्ण और दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण कार्य इस गवर्नमेंन्ट ने किया वह यह अवमूल्यन का कार्य था जिसके कि द्वारा हमारे रुपये की कीमत आज बाजार में गिर गयी है। डीवैलुएशन करते वक्त यह कहा गया था कि इस का सब से बड़ा फायदा जो होगा वह ऐक्सपोर्ट का होगा लेकिन मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि ऐक्सपोर्ट हमारा गिर रहा है, खुद गवर्नमेंट मानती है और इम्पोर्ट बढ़ता जा रहा है। अभी सन् 1965-66 में 838 करोड़ रुपया ऐक्सपोर्ट हुआ जबकि बाहर से जो चीजे मंगाई गई उसी साल में वह 1262 करोड़ रुपये की थीं। यही नहीं बल्कि चाय जो कि सब से बड़ा फोरेन ऐक्सचेंज अर्नर है उस में भी हम पीछे रह गये हैं। सीलोन हम से आगे निकल गया है। चीनी की भी वैसी ही हालत है और पाकिस्तान हम से बहुत आगे चला गया है और नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि हम चीनी के मामले में भी पीछे होते जा रहे हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में वित्तीय स्थिति किस तरीके से हमारी सुधरेगी यह एक बड़ा विकट सवाल हमारे सामने दरपेश है जिसका कि निराकरण होना चाहिए और अगर नहीं होता है तो इस तरीके से हमारा काम आगे नहीं चल सकेगा।

अभी जो बिल हमारे सामने पेश हुआ है उस में कोई चीज एसी नहीं है कि जिसके विरुद्ध कुछ कहा जा सके। जहां तक टैक्स के ढांचे का सवाल है बिल के ग्रोबजैक्टस ऐंड रीजन्स में दिया गया है कि टैक्स के ढांचे को उसी शक्ल में रक्खा जाय जोकि 66-67 में था। अगर इस टैक्स के ढांचे को और इस वित्तीय स्थिति को सुधारने का सवाल नहीं आता वित्त मंत्री महोदय के सामने तो मैं नहीं समझता कि भविष्य में जो बजट पेश होने वाला है उस की क्या हालत होगी टैक्सैज उस में कितने होंगें। जनता जो कि पहले से ही टैक्सों के बोझ से दबी हुई है और दुखी है इन अतिरिक्त टैक्सों के भार से उस की क्या हालत होगी यह आप भलीभांति अंदाजा लगा सकते हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि टैक्स के ढांचे को बदलना ही होगा तभी जाकर हमारी स्थिति सुधर सकेगी।

यह जो नमक के विषय में बात कही गई है वह हर तरीके से अच्छी है। मैं समझता हूं कि इस में जो दिया है :

"clause 5, like section 50 of the Finance Act, 1966, provides that salt shall be duty free for another year."

सिर्फ एक साल के लिए इस में व्यवस्था है कि नमक टैक्स फ्री होगा। मैं समझता हूं कि गांधी जी जिनके कि आदर्श की अक्सर चर्चा होती है, इस हाउस में और बाहर भी, तो वह गांधी जी हमेशा नमक पर टैक्स न लगाने के हेतु लड़ते रहे, जीवन भर उस के लिए वे लड़ते रहे, मैं समझता हूं कि बजाय इस एक साल के कोई ऐसा वायदा वित्त मंत्री महोदय की तरफ से होना चाहिए कि यह नमक पर से टैक्स सदैव के लिए खत्म होने वाला है और हमेशा नमक बिना ड्यूटी के सस्ती दरों पर मिल सकेगा। अभी भी नमक की दरें बढ़ती जा रही हैं।

यह एम्पुटी और इनकमटैक्स के बारे में बहुत सी चीजों का जिक्र है। मैं इस में कोई विरोध ऐसे नहीं करना चाहता हूं लेकिन एक बात कहना चाहता हूं कि डीवैलुएशन के बाद जिन लोगों को रिबेट दिया गया था डीवैलुएशन से पहले जितना रिबेट था उस में व्यवस्था है कि 5 जून 1966 से पहले जिन लोगों ने सामान भेजा है या मुनाफा किया है उन को रिबेट मिल सकेगा और उस के बाद नहीं मिल सकेगा। मैं चाहता हूं कि अगर मैनुफैक्चरिंग के इन कामों को आगे बढ़ाना है तो 6 जून 1966 के बाद से भी यह जो सहूलियत मिलती रही है मैनुफैक्चरर्स और दूसरे लोगों को वह मिलती रहनी चाहिए उस को खत्म नहीं करना चाहिए। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं और आपका आभारी हूं कि आप ने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया।

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Mr. Speaker, Sir . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: देखो श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा . . .

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा: अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पहले डा० लोहिया से माफी मांग रही हूं कि मैं हिन्दी में अच्छी तरह नहीं बोल सकती हूं इसलिए आज तो मैं अंग्रेजी में ही बोलूंगी लेकिन 6 महीने बाद हिन्दी में बोलने की कोशिश करूंगी।

Mr. Speaker: You have only two minutes at your disposal. You have no time to experiment your Hindi.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Sir, I was feeling so sick and depressed while hearing the speeches day in and day out about the mink coats, the diamond necklace or whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker: You are reviving it.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: I do not know which way we are going, which way this country is going, what is going to happen to this country ultimately. If this is the way every day accusations are to be made, I do not know how the Government can function or how we will be allowed to work. They may have some allegations against the Government or against an individual or against the Prime Minister or against the daughter of Shri Nehru, but I requet hon. Members opposite to make it a point to discuss them somewhere else and not use this House as the forum for discussing these matters. If they feel that they are really guilty, they can punish them; the country can punish them, but I am unable to understand where this kind of accusations will lead us to. I will leave it there.

Mr. Speaker: Now please come to the Finance Bill.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Just now the Finance Minister said that anything under the sun can be discussed on this.

Sir, I felt so hurt when I read in the papers that Delhi Corporation removed the photograph of the Prime Minister. I am unable to understand this. If they so dislike her, they need not have put fresh photographs of the Prime Minister but there was no need for them to remove the existing ones. The Jan Sangh from the very beginning has been against the rights of women. From this I have to conclude ultimately that they do not want or they are against women coming to power or ruling this country.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: आप बन जावें प्रधान मंत्री, हम सब आप के चेले बन जायेंगे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर): मैं माननीय सदस्या से एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूं कि पहले राष्ट्रपतिजी का फोटो लगना चाहिए या पहले प्रधान मंत्री का लगना चाहिए?

श्रीमती लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा : दोनों होने चाहिएं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : प्रधान मंत्री का फोटो रिमूव करने की जरूरत इसलिए थी क्योंकि राष्ट्रपति का फोटो नहीं था खाली प्रधान मंत्री का फोटो लगा था ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : उसे भी लगा देते ।

Mr. Speaker: One minute more.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: Sir. I have not spoken either on the Budget or on the President's Address; I was not given an opportunity.

As far as language is concerned, I am one with the hon. Member, Dr. Lohia अंग्रेजी को खत्म करना चाहिए । We have retained English for so long and we have done a mistake; the Government has done a mistake in not improving Hindi and other regional languages with the result that today we are in this mess and we feel so helpless. We are so used to the slavish mentality that we are unable to carry out anything without English. That should go. For that we will suffer anything. I am glad, Sir, that you gave the ruling that we can use all the languages in Parliament in spite of difficulties. That will help us in getting rid of English which is a disintegrating factor in the country. It is not Hindi that is the disintegrating factor; from what we hear and see from the experience of this language issue in the South, it is not so much Hindi but it is this continuance of English that has resulted in all this. In the beginning itself, if we had allowed Hindi to develop and if we had allowed Hindi to absorb as many words as it could from the southern languages—there are so many Tamil words which could be absorbed—then Hindi would have been acceptable. I request that, at least now, we should spend as much money and funds as possible for developing Hindi and other regional languages; they are all national languages. *(Interruptions)*

Shri Rajaram (Salem): Has she settled down in Delhi?

Mr. Speaker: She may not answer them. She may address the Chair.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: My friends are complaining that I am talking in English. There is a saying:

"वज्रं वज्रेण विध्यते"

You use a diamond to cut a diamond. Like that, to remove English. *(interruptions)*

An hon. Member: You speak in English.

Mr. Speaker: She will conclude now.

Shrimati Lakshmikantamma: One more word and I shall finish.

I request that the Finance Minister and the Planning Department will see that because of the fact that there are certain non-Congress Governments in certain States and Congress Government here, nothing should happen to our national policies; our national policies should be kept in tact and should not be allowed to be diluted. As some hon. members said, it is a challenge not only to Congress members, but it is a challenge to all those parties which have been able to form coalition governments—all those parties that are in power, DMK or Swatantra, whatever it is, in the form of verdict of the poeple. It is a challenge thrown to all these people to see how they function in spite of non-Congress Governments in certain States and Congress Government here.

I have no time. I will take the next opportunity to say something.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Kartik Oraon. A new member may be given a chance.

He will take only two minutes. He will not talk about Hindi and all those things. He may talk on the Finance Bill.

Shri Kartik Oraon (Lohardaga): I would like to thank the Finance Minister very much for presenting this Bill. I must say that the Finance Minister has been particular not only in presenting this Bill, but also in observing economy of time because his replies have been very quick, sharp and pointed.

I would straightaway jump into something which has been happening in these Government undertakings. We are running a few industries with foreign collaboration. We are sending some of our Engineers also for training abroad. At the same time, we are getting a large number of technical experts from abroad. My experience, so far as technical experts are concerned, is that we are getting a very huge number of technical experts, with the result that our own Engineers are becoming redundant; they are not able to think freely and act independently because every Engineer is associated with another technical expert. In most cases, the Engineers who get their training abroad and come back, are not engaged on the job for which they got the training, but are engaged in a field for which they have no knowledge. This amounts to fixing square pegs in round holes. I personally feel that the number of these technical experts may be cut down and the period of their stay may be extended because at the present moment, these technical experts come here only for one year. During the first three to six months, they just come and settle down, and by the time they start working, they are asked to go back. We are not being able to make full use of these technical experts. So, my request would be to cut down the number of technical experts and allow them to stay here for about five years. We should do one of two things; either; we should send our engineers abroad for training or get the technical experts here but not both.

Everybody has had the privilege of talking on so many varied subjects. I hope you will not mind giving me a few more minutes because this will be my first and last speech during this session. I hope you will show me some sympathy and allow me to express some of my views or I might say what my impression of this Lok Sabha is. If I would have been blind and brought into this House, without my being given to understand that I had been brought to the Lok Sabha, then I would have gone back with the impression that it was something like say a fish-market. I am very sorry to say so, but I am saying this because I have also had some opportunity of seeing how the Parliament functions in other countries. In other countries, when one Member of Parliament is speaking in Parliament there will be no second Member who will speak. But here we have seen five or six Members all stand up to talk simultaneously, and sometimes, unfortunately even the Speaker allows it.

Another point that I would like to mention is this. We have been talking of so many irrelevant things. That is very unfortunate; yet we have got the privilege of doing something which could have been the subject of action in a court of law. Without realising the dignity of this House, we are functioning here in such a manner that we could have been rightly taken to a court of law, if only we had done such a thing outside. Freedom does not mean that it should not be restricted by law. There is the classic story from America. A man was arrested for swinging his arms in a crowd and thereby hitting the nose of another man. He was brought to the court and arraigned there. He asked the judge 'Why, Judge, are you trying me? Haven't I got the right to swing my arms in a free country?" The judge said 'Yes Sir, the right to swing your arms ends where the nose

[Shri Kartik Oraon]

of another man begins; so, a fine or 10 dollars is imposed'. Here also, we must be guided by a certain code or conduct of this House; otherwise, we shall find ourselves nowhere.

People say that there is a threat of war from China and Pakistan. But I would say that a much greater enemy than Pakistan and China is the process of denationalisation of Indians. We are not sensitive of being Indians. Unless all of us think that we are Indians and as Indians we must not do anything which is not Indian, and unless we apply this measuring rod to ourselves, we shall find ourselves nowhere.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri Kartik Oraon: In conclusion, I would say that we should keep in mind not only the economy of money but also the economy of time.

Shri Morarji Desai: Mr. Speaker, I have been hearing very patiently and, as far as possible, very respectfully to what has been said on the Finance Bill by the several hon. Members who gave their views on this occasion. It is, as I said, a convention that anything can be said on the Finance Bill and the Budget, but that does not mean that I can say anything on it. I do not want to take advantage of that convention, even though I am as good a member of this House as any other.

An hon. Member: Something more than that.

Shri Morarji Desai: But if others do not follow rules, I must at any rate follow them. That is what I believe.

My hon. friend, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, is a very brilliant person in some ways. But his brilliance is unfortunately utilised only in spreading contempt against all people and running down other people. I am not his conscience keeper; I cannot be, nobody can be; and I do not know whether he has a conscience. But I fail to understand why he should have thought that I have claimed to be following in Mahatma Gandhi's footsteps. I have not claimed it. He says that I have spread this fable round about me. I do not know whether he was responsible for it. But I am not responsible for it. I wish when he said that he was very happy that the Prime Minister of France said that Mahatma Gandhi had affected him that my hon. friend had been affected by Mahatma Gandhi.

He also said that he was happy that the salt duty is abolished. There is no salt duty for all the past years. This is a repetition every year that there will be no salt duty. That is how it has gone on. Otherwise, nothing new is being done about it. There is no salt duty here. For all the past years we have been in freedom, there has been a demand from some quarters in this House, in the previous Houses also, that a salt duty should be imposed. So far as I am concerned, I have always said that that will be resisted whatever may be the forces who want to impose it. But even then it is not possible for me to guarantee that it can never be done, because I cannot always be responsible for it.

Many things have been said by him also about the Congress Party. He is welcome to do so. A blind man does not think anybody is seeing. One reflects oneself when one talks about other people. But I am very sorry to see that he should be so contemptuous about everybody else except himself. I hope that we shall not at any rate try to disrupt each other because that would be a very sorry day for this country. He welcomes and asks 30 people to leave this Party and join him. I cannot say anything is impossible in this world. Anything is possible in the world. But let him also consider that double that number can

also walk over from that side to this side.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह जमाना चला गया ।

Shri Morarji Desai: Nothing is impossible: This can happen, that can happen, anything can happen. But let me tell him that I am not going to make any unseemly attempt that he has been making in order to win over people from this side.

That is all I can say.

श्री मधु लिमये : बीस साल से यही करते रहे हैं ।

Shri Morarji Desai: I want to follow rules even though he does not believe in following any rules.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तभी बातें सुन रहे हैं आपकी । यह कौन नियम पालन कर रहे हैं ?

Shri Morarji Desai: It is a great gratitude that I have to express to him for once behaving. I am glad at any rate he is affected by my conduct, because I did not interrupt him, and I am happy to see that at any rate there is somebody who affects him.

Shri Piloo Mody: He is smiling.

Shri Morarji Desai: I am very happy, but I am always happy. Even if he tries to make me unhappy, he cannot do it, it is not within his power to do so. He cannot make me unhappy at any time. I should like to see that he is happy under all circumstances, and that is what we should try to do.

Shri Manoharan: You are analysing his personality?

Shri Morarji Desai: I do not want to go on further about it. I am not analysing his personality, but if I do not take this much notice of him, he would have been very much aggrieved.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब प्रधान मंत्री हो जाओ तब इस तरह से नोटिस लेना । अभी नहीं ।

Shri Morarji Desai: Now, the influence that I had exercised over him is finished, that is what I see. I am glad that it lasted even for this short time.

Fears have been expressed by some hon. Members that the non-Congress State Governments will not be treated fairly or properly, or that there will be interference with them in matters financial or otherwise. I have made myself and the position of Government very clear, that all States are equal for the Central Government, and I suppose, and I hope, that all States will treat the Central Government also equally. We are not divided amongst ourselves. Our interests are common, the interests are the welfare of the people of this country, and in that, we have all got to work under the Constitution. If anybody does not want to work under the Constitution, then he cannot claim any freedom to act unconstitutionally. That is the only limit. If the States, within their own powers, within the Constitution, want to work and act in a manner which I may not agree to, I am not going to interfere with them. It is their right to do so, but if they utilise their finances in such a manner that they have no money left, and they want money from the Central Government which I cannot give, then they will have to find for themselves, I cannot help it. I do not say that the moneys which are with the Central Government are the monopoly of the Central Government. I have never taken that stand. The Central Government's money belongs to the whole country, and it has to be utilised for the whole country.

Our Constitution has laid down specific fields, and specific powers have been given to both the State Governments and the Central Government and we have to act within that. If

[Shri Morarji Desai]

that is to be altered, it can only be altered by this House in a proper manner by changing the Constitution suitably and in a manner prescribed in the Constitution. But until that is done, it becomes the duty of not only this Government, but also the duty of all other Governments, the State Governments, to see that the Constitution is upheld.

Shri Manoharan: Let alone the constitutional provision. What is your reaction? That is the question.

Shri Morarji Desai: Reaction about what?

Shri Manoharan: Reacton about the relations.

Shri Morarji Desai: Relations must be good and cordial, as if the relations are of a family. That is how I look at the relations. Even if my hon. friend does not want to treat me as a member of his family, I will treat him as a member of my family. That is how I look at it. But if he says that if something happens, the States will be incited to do something, it may be secession or something else like that. Well, I know that the talk of secession was there for sometiime.

16 hrs.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): It has been given up now.

Shri Morarji Desai: It was given up as they knew what the penalty was. I am prepared to say that it is only after that it has been given up.

Shri M. R. Masani: That is unfair.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह तो कुटुम्ब की जैसी बात नहीं है। यह धमकी वाली बात है ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : कुटुम्ब में भी अगर कोई ठीक तरीके से बर्ताव न करे तो उस को कहना पड़ता है और कहना चाहिए मगर मुहब्बत से कहना चाहिए और मैं मुहब्बत से ही कह रहा हूं दूसरे तरीके से नहीं कह रहा हूं। मेरी मुहब्बत डा० लोहिया जैसी मुहब्बत नहीं है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर मेरी जैसी मुहब्बत करते तो इतना ज्यादा कामराज न होता ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : कामराज का सवाल ही नहीं है ।

Shri S. Kandappan: We want you to be practical.

Shri Morarji Desai: If there was anything like that, I have no grievance about it. Why has he? I have been defeated under it. I have in no way lost anything; on the contrary I have become richer in my spirit in every way. That is all that I want to say. Perhaps my hon. friend does not value it; therefore he tells me this. I would value his friendship all the while even if he differs from me. I believe in his capacity to think and think properly on many things. Somehow his brilliance takes him off somewhere—I do not know where.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : आप से अलग है इसलिए ज्यादा दुखी हो रहे हो। लेकिन दुनिया आप से अलग है ।

Shri Morarji Desai: I am not sorry that he is away from me because he has chosen a different way, not I. I do not want to be away from anybody. That is how we as human beings ought to behave. That is one thing which I learnt. It is for me to learn what I want and it is for him to learn what he wants.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : किस से सीखा है ? मुझ से या किसी और से ?

Shri Morarji Desai: God help me if I learn anything from him. I learnt from him certainly one thing—not to behave in the manner in which he behaves. There have been, as I said, misgivings about the Centre-State relations. I would only plead that there should be none. None had arisen so far. If in the matter of deficit financing and overdrafts I have said firmly that this ruinous attitude will have to be given up if we are to make good progress, I have said it not with a view to discriminate between State and State or one State and another. I have said that the Centre will have to set an example and the Centre will have to be even more disciplined than the States. Unless the Centre does that, it will have no right to expect from the States that behaviour. That is how I look at the relations between the State and the Centre. At any rate in financial matters that will be adhered to. That is all that I can say. Not only that. If the Centre can help any State within the constitution legitimately, it will be its duty to do so. There is no question of any obligatiion on the State because a State has been helped. But if the States do something which brings the whole country into trouble and the economy of the country is jeopardised, the Centre cannot agree to that kind of procedure being adopted by anybody. We are discussing this within two days with the Chief Ministers and the Finance Ministers of the States. Therefore, I do not think it will be proper for me to speak at length on this matter before I have discussed with them what we can do and what we cannot do. I am very hopeful myself that we will arrive at conclusions which will be correct and which will be in the interest of the country and I hope they will be agreed to by everybody that whereas this is a federation it is not a federation merely in order that there can be looseness about everything. The Central Government has got to see that the States become strong, because, after all, in the strength of the States lies the strength also of the Centre, but if the States weaken the Centre in anyway, then the States can never remain strong and they will also become weak. Both have to strengthen each other and that can be done only if we, within our respective spheres, act properly and within the Constitution and outside that sphere, if we act in a manner where we understand each other properly and have respect for each other properly. This, at any rate, can assure my hon. friends, will be the attitude of this Government and that will be so whatever may be the attitude of others, because that is the only way we can bring co-operation between the States and the Centre. I see no reason why there should be differences which cannot be reconciled; they will be reconciled.

The purpose of this Finance Bill is very much limited. Therefore, no policies have been mentioned or no new policies have been mentioned in this Finance Bill. There will be time enough when the proper Finance Bill for the whole year is presented in the next session, when one can discuss these things far more usefully.

My hon. friend, Shri Piloo Mody, remembers only the orgies of expenditure; this Government does not believe in orgies of extravagance; we see what the orgies of extravagance can do especially to him. He said that we have had a pack of cards and only a joker is wanting, and he supplied it today. He said that the only thing that he expects from this Government is a matter of co-operation: that we should hear them patiently, properly, respectfully, and with understanding; he did not use all these words, but I am adding on to them; and that is what we always do. But they do not do it. They consider that if they speak anything we should all hear patiently, but if we say specially something which they do not like they jump and shout at it; this is not the manner of doing things, and showing co-operation. (*Interruptions*) I am not talking of he or they; I am talking generally; not in this matter; I am

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not telling him particularly, but about the co-operation from the whole Opposition, not from one group of the Opposition. We want co-operation from all, and we must give co-operation. There is no question of that, and whether there is co-operation given to us or not, we must co-operate. I have absolutely no doubt on that point, because it is the function of Government to do so.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : परदेशियों से ज्यादा ।

Shri Morarji Desai: After all, Government also is composed of human beings, and it must not be that they must all be angels and the others should remain what they are; that would be wrong.

Shri Piloo Mody: There is no chance of that.

Shri Mararji Desai: I know; there is no chance of that. Therefore, there was no question of any pathetic plea for co-operation. Why should there be any pathos about it? (*Interruption*). He seems to be very pleased with himself and he thinks everybody is in difficulties. That is not so. But co-operation is wanted especially in the difficult times which we are facing today. It is more vital than it is at any other times. I only request my hon. friends to understand, whatever may be our faults, why we are doing certain things, and to tell us where we are wrong, to tell us with some understanding and with some sympathy.

If that is done, there will be a better atmosphere for doing things.

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia: Tea and sympathy is what he wants.

Shri Morarji Desai: My hon. friend even does not want that!

I am quite sure he will also be able to extend his sympathy.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब बदल जाओगे तब जरूर करूंगा । खूब प्रेम करूंगा जिस दिन बदलोगे ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : कौन बदलेगा कौन नहीं बदलेगा ? मुझे मालूम है कि वह नहीं बदलेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक सही बात कही है ।

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : बिल्कुल सही कहा है । मैं जानता हूं आप को बराबर और कई सालों से जानता हूं । मैं जानता हूं और इसीलिए कहता हूं, वह भी कबूल करते हैं तो इस में तो इत्तफाक है . . .

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : एक में तो इत्तफाक है, यह अच्छा है ।. . यह इब्तदा है इश्क की, देखें कहां कहां जाता है ?

श्री मोरारजी देसाई : इतने इश्क में क्यों फसे हुए हैं ?.......(व्यवधान) . अब मेरी समझ में आया कि इश्क दीवानगी है यह दूसरी कोई बात नहीं है ।

There I do not follow him again.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मेरे रास्ते पर चलो, कल्याण हो जायगा ।

Shri Morarji Desai: It is said that this Government will not last. Whether it lasts or does not last, that is in the lap of Gods; or, maybe in the lap of these people perhaps, if my hon. friends opposite think so. They are arrogating to themselves something which will soon teach them a lesson perhaps, because arrogance never helps anybody.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया: कम से कम आप को तो कोई फायदा नहीं पहुंचा उस से । अपने अनुभव से बोल रहे हैं, कोई फायदा नहीं होता घमंड से ।

Shri Morarji Desai: I entirely agree. Let the physician heal himself! That is all I want to say. If there is any arrogance in me, it certainly should be pointed out and I shall be very happy to learn and apologise for it anywhere. I cannot say that I am always free from it. But at any rate, I can point out the dangers of arrogance. That is all I am trying to do. If this Government does not last, at any rate, I hope it will be agreed that there should be another Government which does better, or if not better, equally well. If that is the assuance which hon. members have, I can have no quarrel. After all, let us be agreed on one thing; that whether this Government lasts or another Government lasts, let the freedom of this country last for ever, that democracy will last for ever in this country and that the forces of democracy will get stronger and not weaker. If that is the common aim of all of us—perhaps not of all—let all those whose common purpose it is at any rate strive to see and do things in such a manner that the forces of democracy are not weakened. This is all the appeal I can make to my hon. friends.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to continue for the financial year 1967-68 the existing rates of income-tax with certain modifications and the existing rates of annuity deposits and to provide for the continuance of certain commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the discontinuance of the duty on salt for the said year be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: We will now take up the clauses and the amendments together.

Clauses 2 to 5

Shri S. S. Kothari (Mandsaur): I beg to move:

Page 2,—

omit lines 3 to 29. (3).

Page 3,—

for lines 11 to 22, *substitute*—

"3. No annuity deposit shall be made by any person for the assessment year commencing on the 1st day of April, 1967". (4)

Page 3,—

after line 22 *insert*—

"3A. No sur-tax under the Companies (Profits) Sur-tax Act, 1964, shall be payable by any company for the assessment year commencing on the 1st day of April, 1967". (5)

Shri N. K. P. Salve: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 30,—

after "in the First Schedule" *insert*—

'(i) in Paragraph A of Part I, under the heading "Rates of income-tax", for existing item Nos. (1) and (2) the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"(1) where the total income does not exceed Rs. 6,000. nil;

(2) where the total income exceeds Rs. 6,000 but does not exceed Rs. 10,000, Rs. 250 plus 10 per cent of the amount by which the total income exceeds Rs. 6,000;".' (7)

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Bhubaneswar): I beg to move:

Page 3, lines 27 and 28,—

omit "; or imported into," (8)

Mr. Speaker: I shall put all the amendments together.

Shri S. S. Kothari: Sir, I want to speak on clause 2.

Mr. Speaker: The discussion is all over now.

Shri S. S. Kothari: Sir, I did not speak in the general discussion because I thought I could speak on clause 2 when the Bill is taken up clause by clause.

Mr. Speaker: No, no. I am putting all the amendments together

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 were put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: I sha'l now put all the clauses together. The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Morarji Desai: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

16.17 hrs.

ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill. Let me remind hon. Members that after this there is a half-an-hour discussion also.

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): Sir, let me also point out that after it is passed here the Bill has to go to Rajya Sabha.

Sir, I beg to move that:

"That Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 and to continue for a further period the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, be taken into consideration."

The Bill itself is a short one: it seeks to replace Ordinance No. 13 of 1966 promulgated by the President on December 23, 1966.

As I informed the House on Tuesday while speaking in response to a Call Attention Notice, it is with great reluctance that I seek from this hon. House the continuance of special powers for dealing with the kind of situation which faces the cotton textile industry and which has naturally caused so much concern to the hon. Members. I do so because I am unable, at any rate, for the present, to see any other way of safeguarding the interests of the millions of our citizens who are affected in one way or another by the difficulties which face this important industry.

I do not propose to take up the time of the House in going over the ground which was covered on Tuesday last. I had the opportunity then to place before the House the facts and figures in regard to the industry and the difficulty which it currently faces. Briefly put, the demand for cotton cloth and yarn has been increasing slowly but steadily. The industry has expanded its productive capacity, both in the organised and in the de-centralised sector, to meet this demand. The production of raw cotton has also broadly kept pace with the rising requirement of the industry for it. But the partial failure of the cotton crop for two successive seasons, in 1965-66 and in 1966-67, has unfortunately made it extremely difficult for the industry to use fully its industrial capacity to meet the country's requirements for cloth. The problems arising out of the shortfall in output in 1965-66 were surmounted without too much difficulty. But the 1966-67 season opened with a depleted carry-over. If the 1966-67 crop had been normal, it would not have been too difficult to ensure smooth operation during the current year. But the weather conditions in this year too were unfavourable with the result that it is feared

that there may not be enough cotton to sustain full working of all the industrial undertakings engaged in the production of cloth througout the year.

16.19 hrs.

[SHRI G. S. DHILLON *in the Chair*]

We have tried to meet the gap by augmenting imports of cotton from abroad. We expect we would have imported a little over 800,000 bales of cotton for being used by the mills during the current season. The House will recall that in the previous year only 527,000 bales had been imported. I am trying to see whether we cannot import a still larger quantity. The cotton situation in the rest of the world is by no means easy and the House is aware of the difficulties we face in raising foreign exchange.

Apart from imports, the supply situation can be improved if raw cotton moves in an orderly manner from producing to consuming areas at appropriate ceiling prices and if available stocks are equitably distributed to all the industrial undertakings engaged in converting it. The House is aware of the measures which have been initiated to achieve this end. These measures, I would like to assure the House would be pressed with determination and with vigour. We owe it to the consumers of cloth and to the labour employed in the industry that the uninterrupted supply of raw cotton is maintained in the coming months at an optimum level.

It has been suggested in some quarters that this objective will be better achieved if controls over cotton and cloth are withdrawn. It has been argued that decontrol would allow economic forces to force an adjustment of demand and supply. May I Sir, ask of those who put forward this argument: what is the cost of this adjustment? Surely, decontrol would push up prices of cotton; weaker mills which are unable to buy cotton at high prices would close down; cloth prices will rise, and those who are unable to buy cloth at high prices will not be able to meet their requirement of this essential material. Economic forces will of course bring about an adjustment between demand and supply. But in the process some industrial undertakings will be shut down, labour employed in these undertakings will be deprived of their livelihood; and consumers will either be unable to satisfy their requirements or be obliged to pay prices higher than they need pay.

We have considered this matter carefully and we have come to the conclusion that we would prefer to bring out an adjustment between demand and supply through the kind of measures contemplated in the Bill before the House. The Bill, as you know, would enable us to conserve the supply of cotton and make it possible to spread sacrifices equitably over different sections and help to safeguard the interests of the weaker sections of the industry, the labour and population.

I am deeply conscious of the losses to the economy in consequence of compulsory curtailment of machine activity. The country loses production, the industry loses profits; labour suffers loss of half a day's wage; despite the compensation which is being provided, and it becomes difficult to restrain price rise. I am, therefore, prepared to run some risk in an effort to minimise these losses. I hope my friend Shri Umanath will be happy to know that consequently it has been decided that for the time being compulsory closure will be restricted to one additional day in every alternate week, instead of in each week, as is the case at present.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): Still it does not satisfy my demand.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am glad that it has partially satisfied him.

This modification will reduce by half the savings which it has been

[Shri Denesh Singh]

possible to achieve over the last four months in the consumption of raw cotton. The response of the market to the measures recently initiated to procure cotton compulsorily at appropriate ceiling prices for supply to needy mills encourages me to hope that the additional quantities required to keep all mills going on the modified basis will be forthcoming. Should, for any reason, this hope be belied, Government would feel compelled to re-intensify the curb on machine activity. I propose to keep myself in constant touch with all interests concerned and to use the powers which are being sought from the House to the best possible advantage of the community as a whole.

The House is aware of the increases which have taken place in the cost of production of cotton textiles. The whole cost of the increase consequent on the rise in the price of cotton, the increase in dearness allowances and the losses arising out of compulsory closures from December onwards, has so far been borne largely by the industry. The revision of prices for controlled cloth, I realise, is now overdue. In making this revision, however, Government must bear the interest of consumers in mind. It will not, therefore, be possible to provide in the revised prices for the full increase in cost of production. We are examining the figures and we hope to be able to announce a decision which assures to the best of our judgement a fair deal to industry and also to the consumers of its products.

Shri Sonavane (Pandharpur): Not to the producer?

Shri Dinesh Singh: The producer has already sold most of his stocks, as the hon. Member knows.

I would appeal to the growers to help in maintaining optimum production in industry by voluntarily offering to sell the stocks they hold and to prepare from now on to increase the yield of cotton per acre. It is only in this way that cotton farmers, in the years to come, can secure a better return for their labours and at the same time contribute to the health of this important industry. The Union Government and the State Governments are giving finishing touches to their plans and will stand ready to provide all help which the farmer may need to achieve this end.

There are many chronic problems which face the cotton textiles industry. I am studying them with a view to seeking structural remedies. I am thinking of having these problems and their solutions studied by a special committee. But, meanwhile, for the duration of the current difficulties, I would wish to see that further additions to the spindleage in the country are postponed.

I trust the House will be convinced that continuing difficulties make it necessary for Government to continue the special powers conferred by Ordinance No. 13 of 1966 to make orders for securing smooth operation of industrial undertakings engaged in the production of manufacture of an essential commodity in which such smooth operation is threatened by inadequacies of supplies of raw materials. I would like to emphasise that these powers are sought to be continued only for a period of one year in the hope that when the next crop comes into the market, it will no longer be necessary for us to continue these extraordinary measures. I would like to repeat the assurance that even during this period Government would keep the restrictions under review and relax or dispense with them as and when the supply situation improves.

I am aware that all is not well with many units of this old established industry. There are some units which in the course of years have been substantially modernised and have achieved a high level of efficiency. There are a number of others which, though not quite so efficient or profit-

able, are still economically viable. But there still remain some more which, because of the age of their plant and machinery, bad location, little or no reserves, heavy financial liabilities, or poor management, are on the verge of extinction in purely economic terms. In a year when demand is high and cotton is available fairly cheaply, they somehow survive; in other years, because of their low efficiency, they cannot afford to bear higher prices of cotton or other raw materials, pay better wages, and yet market their product in competition with the more efficient units of this industry. They are faced with closure, some actually close down. Wherever practicable, having regard to the economic viability as well as basic security for the investment of public funds, Governments, either at the Centre or in the States, step in and try to get them restarted. But, as the House would realise, this is not the real solution. It has been our experience that in many cases, because of the factors already mentioned, the mills are so totally uneconomic or their liabilities so greatly exceed their assets, that any injection of public funds to resurrect them would be a highly hazardous and totally unjustified venture.

Thus, the position is highly unsatisfactory. I am aware of it and I am seriously concerned about it. I have, therefore, already initiated action for a comprehensive review of our entire policy in regard to such mills. We cannot follow a policy of indiscriminate, temporary take-over. This might only encourage other owners/managements to deliberately withdraw the maximum amount of their own funds from such enterprises on one pretext or the other in the hope that Government will come to their rescue. This will obviously be a wrong policy to follow. To my mind, a better alternative might be first to acquire a controlling interest in these relatively uneconomic units and only then invest public funds for their betterment. If this were to be done the benefit of such investment would accrue, not to the original shareholders, their creditors or managements installed by them, but to the State which comes to their rescue. This idea of mine will, however, need very careful examination. It is likely to involve changes in the legal structure. Therefore, what I can say at this stage is that it shall be my endeavour to pursue this proposal as speedily as possible so that this very serious problem can be resolved in a more satisfactory manner and on a long-term basis.

One more word, Sir. While presenting this Bill opportunity has also been taken to provide for the continuance of the powers conferred by Act 47 of 1964. The power of summary trial for certain offences such as hoarding and profiteering, bribery and corruption, had been given only up to 31st December, 1968. We are seeking to have this power extended up to 31st December, 1967.

I do not think I need dwell on this particular clause at any length. All sections of the House would readily agree that the process of bringing hoarders and profiteers to book should be speedy and the situation in the country is such that powers which were given by Act Act 47 of 1964 need to be continued for a further period of one year.

With these words, Sir. I move that the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill, 1967, be taken into consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, and to continue for a further period the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, be taken into consideration."

There are a number of amendments.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham (Visakhapatnam): I want a clarification on two points before we go to amendments.

Mr. Chairman: He may resume his seat. I would like to take the sense of the House as to how much of time they would like to allot for this Bill.

Shri Umanath: Four hours.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : यह इतने महत्व का विषय है देश के अन्दर बहुत से कारख़ाने बंद हो रहे हैं इसलिए सब को मौक़ा मिलना चाहिए। 4 घंटे इस पर डिस्कशन होना चाहिए।

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Dr. Ram Subhag Singh): 30, 35 मिन्ट में पास हो जाना चाहिये क्योंकि This Bill has also to be sent to Rajya Sabha. Therefore, I would very respectfully request the House that this Bill be passed by 5 or 5.15.

Shri Umanath: No, no.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): No. no.

Shri M. R. Masani (Rajkot): This is a very important Bill. Two hours may be given.

Shri Umanath: Already three hours have been allotted for this Bill.

Mr. Chairman: We have an half-an-hour discussion today at 6.30 P.M. There are only two hours. Today is the last day of this session. I think, the Bill should be passed. It has also to go to the Rajya Sabha. Two hours are more than enough.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, यह बड़े महत्व का सवाल है और 4 घंटे से कम नहीं होना चाहिए। इसे 4 घंटे चलाइये यह बड़े महत्व का विषय है। हम लोग 8 बजे तक बैठने को तैयार हैं और इसे वहां पर पास कर के आज ही भेज भी देंगे।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This session was coming to an end on the 7th itself. We extended it till today only on a request that this Bill may not be hustled through.

Shri Umanath: Yes, yes.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We really wanted the whole day for it, i.e., five hours. This is a very important Bill. More than five lakhs of textile workers are involved. We could sit late one more hour today. I am all for it. Let us have at least three hours. Please do not curtail the three hours' time.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: He can sit, but it has to be sent to the other House by 6.00 at the latest.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We were expecting to have at least three hours.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : राज्य सभा सोमवार को भी है हम आज यहां पास कर देंगे सोमवार को यह वहां चला जायगा।

डा० राम सुभग सिंह : सोमवार को कैसे जायगा ? हमें आज ही भेजना है।

Mr. Chairman: There is no unanimity over this. The Treasury Benches have not agreed to this. I think, the time limit upto 6.00 is alright.

Shri M. R. Masani: Upto 6.30.

Mr. Chairman: All right.

Mr. Somani.

Shri N. K. Somani (Nagpur): I am very glad that you have found it possible to give two hours to this important aspect of the textile industry because in certain sections of our House as well as elsewhere, a lot has been sought to be made that the entire textile industry is in doldrums and that the only reason for that—because we are in difficulties in the matter of running the textile industry—should be squarely laid on the management and the industrialists. I would like to put certain viewpoints on behalf of the management and the entire textile

industry. Before commenting on that, I would like to make a general comment that, in the political life of our country, we only learn management by crisis. Whenever a deep situation arises due to a number of factors spread over successive years, then only we become aware of the gravity of the situation and until then, the cancer spreads, just as the symptoms of cancer are ignored over the whole world by millions of people till the patient finds himself completely involved in such a cancerous situation that a remedy is not possible.

I woud like to submit respectfully to this House that the textile industry as well as the other industries, both in the public and in the private sectors, are here to stay, not only to cater to Indian customers and Indian clients; but we have to take our respectful and rightful place in the world markets and in the exports which the country so direly needs.

It is a matter of commonsense and general knowledge that in a battlefield, the combative strength, of ours, the weaponry, the techniques and the leadership that are required by us should at least be equal to those of the enemy, if not superior. Then only we can hold on our own and we could make an impression and we could make advancements.

Here, on the one side, you see that we are expected to increase our exports in the world market. We see that we are asked to improve our performance as far as exports are concerned, be it the textile industry or the paper industry or the engineering industry. For this, we should have the wherewithal, the prerequisites, the essentials, the tools and techniques, the atmosphere in which the industry has to perform and not strangulating rules and regulations. We have all the time to be aware of the situations and of the conditions and of the price structure in the world markets, not only of those that are operating here but in the USA, the UK, the USSR and elsewhere. After the continuous lack of these things, if the policies of our Government still continue to be indifferent to the industry, then, of course, once and for all, we should be told that we are catering essentially to the Indian public, disregarding the cost structure, disregarding the quality and disregarding whatever other jobs we have to do, and we have nothing to do with exports. I would, therefore, like to plead for a long-term policy of encouragement. We should not think of today's exports or of today's labour situation or of financing it for today only. We do not live from day to day. We have to think of 20 years or 25 years or 30 years or 50 years. At every point of time we should not only compare our cost structure, we should not only compare our technological advancement, we should not only compare and equip ourselves with all these things, but we should at least be on a par with the world producing centres; otherwise, we should not be expected to export.

Against this background, for a moment, let us please consider what the textile industry has been subjected to since Independence and even before that. I would like to remind the Commerce Minister that there was a serious move immediately after the Second World War by the textile industry in India to rejuvenate itself, to modernise itself, to rationalise itself and to completely change the old and ancient and antiquated equipment that we had. At that time, a lot of plea was made that that was not the time to rationalise the textile industry that was not the time to improve the productivity or the performance of the textile industry, because it was going to affect directly the employment situation which was serious at that time, and which continues to be serious even now. If at that time, mills were not allowed to change, if at that time we were not allowed to be equivalent to our counterparts in he world, how are we expected, especially after a series of controls, the series of such strangulating policies and factors that have come into being as have made

[Shri N. K. Somani]

it nearly impossible for a large majority of the textile mills in this country, to operate efficiently and economically? There have been efforts and there have been moves to give a dog a bad name and try to hang it.

As far as I am concerned, I would say that we are interested in national interest, not only in increasing the production and productivity from the textile industry but in increasing the production and productivity of the entire industry. As the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance has said, and as the other leadership of our country has said on several occassions outside and in the House, what the country needs today is more production; it needs more efficiency; it needs more hard work on the part of industry, on the part of labour and on the part of everyone concerned.

I would, therefore, briefly go througn the background of what we have been subjected to. You know, Sir, that cotton forms 50 per cent of the price of cloth in any given production and at least 65 per cent of the cost of yarn. Now if succeedingly due to scarcity conditions and neglect of the growth of cotton both in its output and in its per acre yield and quality, cotton has not been made available and imports have been very scanty, we certainly cannot blame the textile industry in not being able to operate within the ceilings which are both out of date and inadequate.

I would like to submit that only 40 per cent of cloth is subject to price control and the costs that have risen are completely out of proportion to the price rise. Therefore, we would have to think not only of some long-term remedies but also of short-term remedies because of the crisis that has overtaken us. Cotton growth has not kept pace with the increase in the spindlage, with the increase in the looms that has taken place in the country. Therefore, we are faced with this situation. Scientific methods of cultivation have not been given due prominence.

I would respectfully submit that not only should the cotton textile mills be encouraged to go into production of this agricultural commodity by giving them special incentives, but they should be able to bank upon the technological advances that have been made. I thas been demonstrated that special quality cotton can be grown in this country. I do not know why it is impossible for us to raise our per acre yield. I do not know why it is impossible for us until now to improve the quality of cotton grown. I do not know why we have not been able to boost up and have adequate supplies of cotton within our own country.

After all, the textile industry has been given a second-rate position. It should not definitely be treated with so much disregard because it is not only the largest and the oldest of our industries but it yields crores of rupees of excise duty and also earns a colossal amount of foreign exchange. Therefore, this industry should have a claim on the revenues derived from it. I know that if there are any surpluses, they should be utilised for investment in other projects. But the primary task of improving the textile industry, the primary task of being able to renovate it based on its own foreign exchange earnings should also be kept in view.

Take, for example, the wage position. The dearness allowance in Bombay used to be Rs. 89 in 1960. Today it is Rs. 160. The dearness allowance in Ahmedabad used to be Rs. 88 in 1960; in 1967 it is more than Rs. 161. Consider the rise in Kanpur in the matter of D. A. Whereas it used to be Rs. 60 in 1960, it is Rs. 127 this year.

Compare the cost of cotton, the cost of power, the cost of replacement, the cost of capital. Are we in one stroke to under-write the consumer in respect of all these costs without a commentsurate increase in the selling prices of cloth?

I would like to bring another vital factor to the House's attention. All foreign Governments, whether American, British, European or German, are taking vigorous steps over the last ten years—because the cotton textile industry is passing through a series of crisis not only here but in all other countries—to modernise and renovate the industry, allowing the completely out of date and antiquated units to die down, allowing them to rationalise by means of tax concessions, tariff barriers and other encouragement so that the textiles produced in those countries do not suffer. On the other side, we in this country only come to expect the textile industry to keep on increasing its exports disregarding the cost structure, ignoring the conditions under which they have to operate, overlooking all these attitudes of the Government.

I would like to make one or two suggestions for the serious consideration of the hon. Minister. This is an unfortunate pity that at the moment our house is divided. The cotton trader, the industry, Government and the public are not on talking terms, as far as the textile industry is concerned, which is a very bad sign, and the first thing that the hon. Minister can very usefully do, and very gainfully do, is to put all these warring factions together, because, after all, the interests of the cotton grower are not something which are against the textile industry, and the interests of the textile industry are not something which are against the nation. Therefore, not only to investigate but also to come to long-term suggestions which are acceptable to all people concerned, should be the first step as far as I am concerned.

The question under discussion is about cotton requisition and closure of mills for a day per fortnight. I would like to submit that we should not treat all cotton textile mills with the same policy. In this country, as the hon. Minister has just now pointed out, we have very highly modern, efficient and export-oriented mills; we have mills that should better be shut because they are completely out of date; we have mills whose economy is on the border line, which, if given the requisite dose in time, can certainly spring back to life. Certainly you do not want to mete out treatment or justice with one blind figure. I would, therefore, respectfully submit before concluding that those mills which are exporting, those mills which are highly efficient should not be allowed to close; we should increase this closure as far as the old and antiquated mills are concerned, and this should certainly be done.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति महोदय, जो बिल सदन के सामने रखा गया है, मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूं क्योंकि कुछ मात्रा में क्यों न हो, इस बिल से मजदूरों को राहत मिलेगी और जो कठिनाई कपास के मिलने में है उसमें कुछ मदद मिलेगी। एक दृष्टिकोण अभी मुझ से पूर्व वक्ता ने आप के सामने रखा। जो हमारा ऐसेन्शल कमोडिटीज ऐक्ट है उस के पढ़ने के बाद, और मेरा ख्याल है कि पिछले ग्यारह या बारह वर्ष से यह हमारे देश पर लागू है में समझता हूं कि इस में कुछ और तरमीमें होनी चाहियें थी इस का अनुभव करने के बाद मालूम हुआ कि इसमें कुछ चीजें ऐसी हैं जिनकी जरूरत नहीं है और कुछ चीजें ऐसी हैं जिनको और ज्यादा होना चाहिये।

एक तरह से यह बिल इन्कम्प्लीट है और केवल एक ही समस्या को ले कर इस सदन के सामने आया है। जो एसेन्शल कमोडिटीज ऐक्ट है वह जम्मू और काश्मीर पर लागू नहीं होता। मैं समझता हूं कि इस को जम्मू और काश्मीर पर भी लागू होना चाहिये, क्योंकि वहां के लोग भी हमारे देश के हिस्से हैं और उन लोगों को भी सस्ते दामों पर अच्छी चीज हमेशा मिलती रहनी चाहिये, जो कि इस ऐक्ट का उद्देश्य है। मैं अपने मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वह इस पर विचार करें, जब इस में कुछ अमेंडमेंट आयें, कि यह बिल जम्मू और काश्मीर पर भी लागू होना चाहिये।

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

जैसा मैंने बतलाया, इस बिल का उद्देश्य सप्लाइज, डिस्ट्रिब्यूशन और कीमतों को रेगुलेट करना है, लेकिन अगर व्यवहार में देखा जाये तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह अपने उद्देश्य में पूरा नहीं उतरा है। लोग तो यह समझते हैं कि सरकार अपनी कीमतें तय करती है और हर एक चीज हमें सस्ती मिलेगी, अच्छी मिलेगी और समय पर मिलेगी। लेकिन अनुभव कुछ दूसरा ही है। जो चीजें सरकार ने अपने कंट्रोल मे ली हैं, जो कि एसेन्शल कमोडिटीज हैं, जैसे शुगर है, इम्पोर्टेड व्हीट है, राइस है, डालदा है या कपड़ा है, उन की कीमतें जितनी बढ़नी चाहियें थी शायद उस से कई गुनी ज्यादा बढ़ी हैं। इस का एक कारण है कि जो इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उन को कंट्रोल करने वाली वह आर्गेनाइज्ड हैं, उन के पास पैसा बहुत है, उन के पब्लिक रिलेशन्स हैं। उन के मुकाबले में जो हमारा ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है, आप मानेंगे कि वह इनएफिशिएन्ट है, उस में रेड टैपिज्म है और करप्शन है। जिस ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में इनएफिशिएन्सी, रेड टेपिज्म, करप्शन जैसी चीजें हैं उस ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन को आप जितनी भी कंट्रोल करने की पावर्स दें, वह उन को कंट्रोल नहीं कर पायेगा। नतीजा यह होगा कि जो वैस्टिड इंटिरेस्ट्स हैं जो बड़े-बड़े लोग हैं उनको वे किसी न किसी तरीके से प्रभावित करके अपना काम करवा लेंगे। इस तरह से लोगों को सस्ता अनाज नहीं मिलेगा, लोगों को सस्ती चीजें नहीं मिलेंगी। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूं कि जैसे कल राज्य सभा में लाइसेंसिंग के बारे में एक रिपोर्ट आई थी उसी तरह से अगर सरकार पिछले दस सालों की इस तरह की एक रिपोर्ट मंगवाए कि ये जो कंट्रोल्ड हैं या यह जो ऐक्ट है इसको ठीक प्रकार से कार्यान्वित किया गया है या नहीं किया गया है, और इसके लिए एक कमेटी बनाई जाए तो अच्छा होगा। तब हमें वास्तविक स्थिति का पता चल सकेगा। मैं समझता हूं कि जो रिपोर्ट इस कमेटी द्वारा प्रस्तुत की जाएगी उसको देख कर आपको आश्चर्य होगा। इस रिपोर्ट को देख कर आप को पता लगेगा कि जो कंट्रोल्ड चीजें हैं, इनके दाम जब सरकार निश्चित करती है तो वैसा करते समय यह जरूरत से ज्यादा इनके दाम बढ़ा देती है और बढ़ाती गई है। इसका कारण यह है कि जो वैस्टिड इंटिरेस्ट्स है, जो पैसे वाला वर्ग है और वह वर्ग जो अफसर लोग हैं उनको प्रभावित करके किसी न किसी तरीके से दाम बढ़वा लेता हैं और अन्त में जा कर जो नुकसान है वह कज्यूमर को उठाना पड़ता है, उपभोक्ता को उठाना पड़ता है। उसको सस्ते दाम पर चीजें नहीं मिलती हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि इसके बारे में सरकार इनक्वायरी करवायें कि कहां तक यह जो एक्ट है इसका ठीक प्रकार से पालन हुआ है और इस एक्ट का जो आघात है, जो दंड है, वह किस को भुगतना पड़ा है। इसका आघात छोटे छोटे व्यापारियों पर हुआ है। इसका कारण यह है कि जो प्रोसीजर है वह बहुत ही कम्पलीकेटिड है, बहुत ही टेढ़ा है। जो रूल्ज बनाये गये हैं उनके कारण छोटे छोटे व्यापारी बहुत तंग होते है। इंस्पैक्टर लोग जाते हैं और वे उनको तंग करते हैं। उनको उठा कर अन्दर धर देते हैं। छोटे छोटे व्यापारियों से रिश्वत मांगी जाती है और अगर वे नहीं देते हैं तो उनको पकड़ लिया जाता है। रिश्वत की उनकी यह रकम बंधी रहती है हर एक दुकानदार से। कोई दस रुपये महीना देता है तो कोई पंद्रह रुपये। इन छोटे-छोटे व्यापारियों को तो तकलीफ होती है लेकिन जो बड़े-बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट हैं उनको कोई तकलीफ नहीं होती हैं। उनके साथ बड़े-बड़े व्यापारी मिले रहते हैं। नतीजा यह होता है कि चीजों के दाम बढ़ते जाते हैं और आपने देखा है कि डालडा के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं, चीनी के दाम बढ़ रहे हैं। ये दाम इतने बढ़ते हैं जितनी कास्ट उनकी नहीं बढ़ती है।

एक और दिक्कत की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। दिल्ली में जो चीनी दी जाती है वह चीनी मेरठ से आती है। मेरठ की मिलें चीनी को ज्यादा भाव से बेचती हैं।

उसके मुकाबले में मुरादाबाद की जो मिलें हैं वे सस्ते दामों पर चीनी बेचती हैं । इसका नतीजा यह होता है कि एक करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा एक साल में दिल्ली के लोगों को इसलिए देना पड़ता है क्योंकि उनको मेरठ से चीनी सप्लाई होती है । अगर मुरादाबाद से सप्लाई हो तो दिल्ली वालों को एक करोड़ रुपया कम देना पड़े । मैं कहूंगा कि इसकी आप इनक्वायरी करायें और दिल्ली के लोग जो कई सालों से एक करोड़ रुपया ज्यादा दे रहे हैं यह बन्द होना चाहिये । अगर आप मुरादाबाद से चीनी नहीं दिलवा सकते हैं तो मेरठ के जो चीनी के दाम हैं उनको मुरादाबाद की मिलों के चीनी के दामों के बराबर करें । यह चीज़ चार पांच साल से चल रही है । किसी कारण से, किसी घोटाले की वजह से अभी तक यह हो नहीं पाया है । यह एक बार हो भी गया था कि दाम एक जैसे हों । लेकिन फिर पता नहीं क्यों ये एक समान नहीं किये गये । मैं चाहता हूं कि अब ये दाम आपको एक जैसे करवाने चाहिये और अगर आप ऐसा नहीं कर सकते हैं तो दिल्ली को आपको मुरादाबाद से चीनी लेने की इजाज़त देनी चाहिये ।

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) : मुरादाबाद से क्यों, बिजनौर से क्यों नहीं ।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : बिजनौर से मिले, तो शायद चीनी और भी सस्ती पड़ेगी । हिन्दुस्तान में सब मिला कर जो कम्पोजिट मिलें हैं उनकी संख्या 603 के करीब है । ये टैक्सटाइल मिल्ज हैं । उन में करीब साढ़े नौ लाख मजदूर काम करते हैं । मेरा कहना यह भी है कि अभी कुछ महीने पहले व्यापारियों से जो बेल्ज खरीदी गई थीं वे ब्लैकमार्किट में खरीदी गई थीं, सौ सौ और डेढ़ सौ रुपये दे कर ब्लैकमार्किट में उनको खरीदा गया था । ये बेल्ज लोगों ने स्टाक में रखी हुई थीं । मेरी इनफार्मेशन के मुताबिक लगभग बीस लाख बेल्ज या तो बड़े बड़े व्यापारियों के पास हैं या बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के पास हैं या जो बड़े बड़े जमींदार हैं उनके पास हैं । चूंकि आप कंट्रोल लगाते हैं और प्रोक्योरमेंट के लिए कोई मशीनरी आपके पास नहीं है इस वास्ते यह होर्डिंग होता है ऐसा मैं समझता हूं । अगर कंट्रोल हो तो पूरा होना चाहिये, शुरू से आखिर तक होना चाहिये और आपके पास प्राक्योरमेंट के लिए कोई मशीनरी होनी चाहिये वर्ना वह नहीं होना चाहिये । आपने सीलिंग प्राइस तय की है, फ्लोर प्राइस तय की है और जब सीलिंग प्राइस से कीमतें बढ़ जाती हैं—चूंकि दुनिया में कपास कितनी पैदा होती है उस पर यह डिपेंड करता है—तब दिक्कतें पैदा होना शुरू हो जाती हैं । अब देखने में यह आ रहा है कि लोगों ने कपास बोना बन्द कर दिया है क्योंकि कपास बोने से उनको नुकसान होता है और जो मिलें हैं वे कपास की स्केरसिटी को अनुभव कर रही हैं चाहे यह स्केरसिटी आर्टिफिशल हो या न हो और इस स्केरसिटी की वजह से वे लोग ब्लैक में बेल्ज खरीद रहे हैं । इसलिए यह इंतज़ाम होना चाहिये कि किसी न किसी तरीके से यह जो होर्डिंग है चाहे यह व्यापारी के लेवेल पर हो या इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट के लेवेल पर हो या जमींदार के लेवेल पर हो यह खत्म हो । साथ ही साथ जब तक हमारी एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन कमजोर है, इनएफिशेंट है तब तक उसको कंट्रोल कम से कम लगाना चाहिये । आपके पास एक ही तरीका है कि कंट्रोल लगा दो, सारी स्थिति सुधर जाएगी । मैं इसको सिद्धान्त रूप में अच्छा नहीं समझता हूं । कंट्रोल जितना आप लगायेंगे उतनी करप्शन बढ़ेगी और सही मानों में वह कंट्रोल नहीं होता है ।

अभी मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि कपड़े के दाम बढ़ने वाले हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि यह जो बोझ है यह उपभोक्ता पर नहीं पड़ना चाहिये । अगर आपने दाम बढ़ाने ही हैं तो जो ड्यूटी है उसको आप कम कर दें और कंज्यूमर से कपड़े के दाम ज्यादा चार्ज न करें। पहले ही कंज्यूमर बोझ से दबा हुआ है और उसको और ज्यादा नहीं दबाया जाना चाहिये । मैं चाहता हूं कि

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

कपड़ के ो दाम आज हैं वे वही रहने चाहियें। अगर कहीं उनको पैसा देना है तो ड्यूटी कम करके दिजिय ।

Shri N. C. Chatterjee (Burdwan): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the industry's point of view has been very well put before the House by the first hon. Member who spoke on the Bill. I think that case could not be better put, and I congratulate him on it. But we are not satisfied when it is said that the industries are wholly free from all blemish and blame, when the artificial imbalance between demand and supply was there. We honestly felt that in this particular crisis, the industry did not play a proper part; possibly with their co-operation, the difficulty in securing equitable distribution could have been mitigated.

I am on one point. I also agree with Mr. Kanwarlal Gupta, the hon. Member who just now spoke, that this kind of Bill should also be extended to the State of Jammu and Kashmir. I was one of those few in this House who raised this point in the year 1953, for the first time when I moved the resolution for getting Kashmir integrated into India, and when the great Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji started the movement outside for this kind of thing. I am glad that there has been good response now, and there is a general willingness that Kashmir should come into the category of the legislative sphere throughout India so that there will be no inequality. I am happy that that is now being accepted by the Jammu and Kashmir Government. Again, the Minister is perfectly justified in bringing this measure before the House. There is no escape, and it has got to be done, because the ordinance is lapsing.

The only point that is troubling me is this. Is it constitutionally permissible to have clause 4B? Kindly look at page 2 of the Bill; just see what they are doing. Clause 4B says as follows:

> "(4B) Where in pursuance of an order under clause (b) of sub-section (4A) an undertaking is closed, whether partially or wholly for any day or number of days in a week, the employer of the undertaking shall pay for such closure to each of the persons employed in the undertaking or any part thereof which is closed, compensation which shall be equal to fifty per cent. of the total of the basic wages and dearness allowance that would have been payable to such person had there been no such closure."

We are changing the statute itself. The whole Bill is not limited to this particular crisis which faced this particular industry and for which a particular ordinance had to be introduced. This is a general measure, a general change in the law. Is it proper? Is it permissible under our Constitution? Is it permissible to do away with all fundamental rights or to abrogate and amend the fundamental rights? This is the basic norm of our Constitution. The fundamental rights are the cardinal principles which cannot be suppressed or abridged. I remember the great Sardar Patel saying, "I would not like to pay compensation to the landlords and all the big zamindars; but if we have any such Bill, I would say it will be legal dacoity and I would never be a party to it." Look at clause 4A(b). In any industry, whatever its shortcomings in any particular situation, if the Government thinks that there should be a closure, Government will order the closure. It says:

> "No employer shall keep his undertaking working for more than such number of days in a week and such number of hours each day, as may be specified in the order."

17 hrs.

Any moment the Commerce Minister can pass an order that a particular

mill shall not work for 4 days in a week and although the closure is not demanded by the industry and it is not due to the volution of the industry, yet compulsory compensation should be paid! This is against the basic principles of compensation.

The Supreme Court of India has laid down what compensation means in that great case which came from Bengal. Millions of refugees were coming and squatting in the garden houses of the big people near about Calcutta. Dr. B. C. Roy was approached and he wanted that the squatters should be regularised. He said, "All right; you came in 1949 and squatted. I will pay compensation to the owners at the prices which prevailed in 1949." But the Supreme Court said, compensation means that which compensates for the default, for the loss of the thing imposed by the violation of the particular person. Therefore, you must pay them compensation at the rate which prevailed on the date on which the notification was issued. It became a huge amount and the Bengal Government could not pay it and millions of refugees are still in a pitiable plight. Possibly the same is the position in Punjab. I do not know.

Is it fair, just, equitable or permissible under our Constitution to give the power to Government to pass an order to make the industry pay for a closure ordered by the Government? I do not know whether the Minister has considered this aspect of the matter and consulted the Law Minister, the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General or anybody else. This is troubling me. Can you demand that they shall pay 50 per cent of the wages and DA to all the employees when they are not working, only because the Government orders the closure, although the industry is willing to work?

There is another aspect. Apart from the fact that this kind of clause will be against the spirit of the Constitution and against the guaranteed fundamental, basic, human rights, it will foster indiscipline and will not lead to industrial peace. Therefore, I want to know if he has considered this aspect and whether the industry has accepted this position. Possibly in a particular case like this crisis, there may not be difficulty. But when they are legislating for ever, making a basic change giving the power to the executive to impose this kind of compulsory closure, they should be careful. I want to know whether the legal, constitutional aspect has been verified and the Minister is satisfied that he has got the power and the Parliament is competent to enact such a legislation.

Shri Shantilal Shah (Bombay North West): Sir, I rise to support this Bill and to make a few suggestions. Before that, I should like to meet some of the points raised by Mr. Chatterjee. I am sure he is aware that payment of half the wages as compensation during the period of lay-off is already existing now under the Industrial Disputes Act. That is to say, where for any fault of the employer, the factory is closed, he has to pay half the wages to the workers. This is an extension of the same principle. There are sufficient guidelines provided in clause 4A. They do not give to the Government absolute power, but power which has been restricted and has been circumscribed. The first thing that is said in this section is:

> "Where, for any reason, supplies of any article or thing required for the production or manufacture of an essential commodity are not adequate to meet the full requirements of all the undertakings...."

Therefore, the first thing is that the full requirements cannot be met. The second thing is:

> "The Central Government is of opinion that with the available supplies of such article or thing all the undertakings engaged in the production or manufacture of such commodity should, as far as praticable, be kept as going concerns....."

[Shri Shanti Lal Shah]

That is the second guide line. The last one is:

> "...to the fullest extent possible and also for the prevention of unemployment, as far as practicable, amongst persons employed in such undertakings,...."

With these three guide lines I am of the view—I do not wish to match my legal knowledge with that of the hon. Member, he is pretty senior—that there is nothing unconstitutional in the provision as made.

I will, however, come to the Bill itself. I will also, in anticipation of the amendments speak on the proposal that the full wages should be paid. I would like that closures under this Act should be as few as possible. I am grateful to the hon. Minister for his announcement that instead of the mil's being closed every Saturday as heretofore, they will be closed every alternate Saturday. That is to say, the closures will be half of what it used to be.

What has been the consequence, and what has happened up to now? Taking from 3rd December up to date the total closure has been for 17 days, and the total consumption of cotton in the industry, as mentioned in the statement laid by the Minister before the House, was between 6.2 million and 6.6 million. That is to say, normally a textile mill in this country works for 305 to 308 days, and taking the average working as 306 days one-eighteenth of the working has been closed. Saving of cotton bales by closure on every Saturday, for these 17 days, would be roughly 3,50,000 to 3,60,000 bales. I find that in the statement laid before the House by the hon. Minister he has given all statistics but he has failed to mention the saving of cotton bales as a result of this closure for these 17 days. As I have got the figures now, for these 17 days closure, on the basis of 306 days working, the saving of cotton bales will be 3,50,000 to 3,60,000 bales. That should be added to the total stock available. I also concede that whereas in his statement before this House he has put the total as 5.6 in the Upper House he has put the production as 5:3. Again, I concede that it is not enough that at the end of the year you consume all the stock: some carry-over ought to be provided.

But taking all these factors into consideration, I would still appeal to the hon. Minister to consider whether even this limited closure which he has proposed can be avoided. I am trying to place before you how it works out. As far as the textile worker is concerned, on an average, in Bombay and Ahmedabad and also in the south, he earns about Rs. 200 per month or roughly Rs. 7 per day. He has lost by way of loss in wages for these 17 days roughly half of Rs. 120—because half has been given by the industry—which comes to Rs. 60. If this goes on at the end of the year he will lose a full month's wages which is a very heavy loss. On the one hand, when the worker says that he is not able to make both ends meet and he wants full neutralisation, on the other, this cuts into the neutralisation which has been granted. The remedy suggested is worse than the disease. The remedy suggested is that full wages should be paid. Today at least half the burden is on the mills. The proposal is that the whole burden should be on the textile mills. The textile industry has already shouldered the burden of 5 per cent increase given a few months ago. If the full burden is shifted on to them, I am afraid a very large number of textile mills will have to be closed. I have some knowledge of the textile industry both in the State of Maharashtra and in the State of Gujarat and though their balance sheets for the year ending 31st March are not ready, I am afraid that a large number of big units will come in the red when those balance sheets are prepared. Therefore, it will not be in the interest of labour to ask for full compensation instead

of half compensation and lay off, because if they do that the result may be that the industry may have to close down. My view is that the industry is like a cow. Take as much milk as you like, as best as you can, but see that the cow is not killed. If the industry is closed, the workers will lose employment. Therefore, the reasonable thing for the workers to do will be to see that the industry gets to working, take as much as possible in the form of wages, dearness allowance and bonus but not to force the closure of the industry. If the whole wages are out on the industry then there will be a much greater closure than heretofore.

The other point was about the grower. I am afraid he does not come into the picture now. As far as I can see, all the cotton has passed out of the hands of the grower and it is now with the trader. If any incentive is to be given to the grower, then a further revision of prices should be announced just before the monsoon. But to do it now will not do any good to the grower and might do good to those who are holding up cotton.

In these circumstances, what do we do? My suggestion is this. The savings in cotton is 20,000 to 22,000 bales per day even if the mills are allowed to work. The new cotton season will commence in September and the new crop will begin to come in October. In September there will be a very fair estimate of the likely cotton crop. Then it will be possible to decide whether it will be possible to carry on without any closure at all. My submission is that it would be possible provided the present system of requisitioning and the present production are continued. I am suggesting that there should be no closure at all, not even on alternate Saturdays. Then, in September or early October they would be in a position to know what has been the total imports. Yesterday the hon. Minister mentioned that Government is importing some cotton from the United Arab Republic and from Sudan. We may be able to import more cotton.

If all these are taken together, possibly without any closure government might be able to work all the mills. But supposing closure becomes necessary, my suggestion is that in October the mills may be given a block closure of 8 or 10 days as may be necessary. I will tell you why I am saying this. This closure of 8 or 10 days should be set off against the holidays with wages which the workers are entitled under the Factories Act. The result would be that the workers would not lose the wages. The workers will then enjoy full wages, as desired by the hon. Members. The industry will not have any additional burden because in any case the industry will have to pay 15 days wages under the Factories Act. Therefore, asking the industry to pay it in a block will not add to the burden of the industry, giving the workers off for 10 days or so with full wages instead of half wages will be advantageous to the workers, and the whole situation can be considered in September, so that without any loss of wage to the workers and without any extra burden on the industry, and after assessing the future imports which we can make, and the crop possibly it may be practicable to carry on the mills without any closure

Shri Umanath: That scheme will mean that when his health is not good he will not get leave. His medical leave is adjusted against the closure.

Shri Shantilal Shah: Of course. His choice is between starving and falling sick.

I feel that if this matter is left to be negotiated between the trade unions and the industry, they will be able to settle it and come to an amicable settlement. If the desire is that we should put the burden on the industry, I have nothing to say. I am not one of those who would desire to do it that way. I would request that the hon. Minister may consider the savings already mode, 3,52,000 to 3,60,000 bales,

[Shri Shantilal Shah]

the saving which is likely to be made, the prospect of future crop and the likely imports. If all this is done, possibly no closure would be necessary. May I request that he may reconsider his position, that this Bill may be passed but the powers may be kept in reserve to be utilized if any when he finds it necessary?

Mr. Chairman: Shri Viswanathan.

Shri K. N. Pandey (Padrauna): Kindly look to this side also. We also want to speak.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : आपकी तरफ से तो सरकार बोलेगी। हमें बोलने दीजिए।

Some hon. Members *rose*—

Shri K. N. Pandey: This is a very important subject so far as we are concerned.

Shri Manubhai Patel (Dabhoi): We should be allowed to participate.

Mr. Chairman: Did you send your names?

Shri Sonavane: I have already sent my name. Three days back I gave it.

Shri K. N. Pandey: My name is K. N. Pandey.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: Mr. Chairman.....

Mr. Chairman: I have called Shri Viswanathan of the DMK.

Shri Tenneti Viswanatham: Will I be allowed to speak?

Mr. Chairman: I will call one Member from this side and later on you may be called.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Parties should be given time.

Shri G. Viswanathan (Wandiwash): Mr. Chairman, the Minister wants to hurry up and pass this Bill. I want to submit that this is an important measure and it deals with the lives of millions of mill workers and poor weavers.

The closure of cotton mills in Madras State has caused untold misery and hardship to both the mill workers and the handloom weavers. Already eight mills have been closed down and I understand that 19 mills are going to follow suit. This means that already 18,000 workers are thrown out of employment and many more thousands will be going out of employment very soon. This is a very serious condition.

The number of mill workers in Tamilnad in September 1966 was 1,23,726. I am very much agitated about the future of these mill workers. Though the Government has asked the mill-owners to close the mills one day in a week, the mill-owners are generous enough to close down the mills all the seven days in the week. The workers are left in the lurch like orphans. The Government must take immediate steps to re-open these mills.

Sir, our State is well known for handloom cloth. I am proud to say that about 70 to 80 per cent of the exportable varieties of handloom cloth is produced in Tamilnad. Most of them are produced by handloom weavers. The handloom weavers are in a poor condition. On 31st March, 1963, the number of registered handlooms was 5,16,086. The handloom weavers are the worst affected people by the closure of mills. They are unable to make both ends meet. They cannot escape from the clutches of poverty in which they have fallen.

The price of yarn is too high. The weavers have to purchase the yarn, make cloth from it and sell the cloth. They are unable to purchase the yarn at those high prices. So, most of them work for wages and the wages that they receive are too low. Because of the closure of spinning mills

they do not get the yarn and most of them remain unemployed. Not even for a single day or two in a week they get employment.

To put in a nutshell, the handloom weavers in our State are born in poverty, live in poverty and die in poverty. The Government have so far done nothing to uplift their standard of life. We have been demanding now and then that they must be shown some preferential treatment. We had been demanding that the bordered *sarees* and *dhoties* should be allocated to the handloom industry and the mills should be prohibited from producing these bordered *sarees and dhoties*. They should be produced only by the handlooms. I think, the Minister will be generous enough to accept this demand.

There are many co-operative spinning mills in our State. They cannot compete with the private mills. Those co-operative spinning mills are supplying yarn to these handloom weavers. Hence, these co-operative spinning mills must be shown some preferential treatment at the time of distribution of cotton.

Sir, the Bill mentions the payment of 50 per cent of the total wages and allowances for the days on which the mills are closed. The Minister will be required to justify this. This is very unjust. Full pawment should be made to the employees even if the mill is closed on a particular day.

The Minister should not feel proud in importing foreign cotton. I find from the report that import has gone up from 527,000 bales to 950,000 bales. We should feel ashamed to import foreign cotton even after the much-boasted three big five-year plans.

The Government must take immediate steps to supply yarn to the handloom weavers and to reopen the mills that are closed. Again, I would request the Minister to find ways and means to export more and more of our handloom varieties to foreign countries.

Finally, I may say that, if it is going to neglect the legitimate demands of the millions of mill workers and handloom weavers and pursue the same policy, a sort of *laissez faire* policy, regarding employment, I am sure, the city of Delhi, which is the graveyard of so many empires, will soon witness the downfall of the Congress dynasty, if I may say so.

Mr. Chairman: One request to the members. Whenever they send their names to me, they may please indicate the Party to which they belong.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : यह तो जैनरल विषय है अगर दल के नाम से भेजेंगे तो कोई नहीं बोल पायगा । इसलिये जो समय मांगता है उसको समय दिया जाय ।

Some hon. Members *rose—*

Mr. Chairman: When the Chairman is on his legs, it is not proper that the members should stand. This is a very elementary courtesy. It is not bad to make frequent references to notes but it is not proper to read the whole speech from the notes. I would request the members kindly to avoid it.
Mr. Rane.

Shri Rane (Buldana): I rise to speak today on behalf of the cotton growers. The interests of cotton growers during the last 15 years have suffered to the tune of several crores of rupees on account of the anti-growers price policy pursued by the Government. I submit that the Government is most unwilling to raise the price of cotton. If you examine the figures, you will find that from 1951-52 to 1961-62, the ceiling price was Rs. 820 per candy and the floor price was Rs. 497. For ten years continuously, not even by a single rupee, the price was raised. During these ten years, as we all know. the prices of other commodities have doubled or even trebled.

An hon. Member: Cloth also.

Shri Rane: I am coming to that also.

I have brought it to the notice of Government several times, but I must confess that I have failed completely or partially. If the Government wants to solve this question of supply of cotton—short supply of cotton—it is time they took a long-term policy. As I said, from 1951-52 to 1961-62, the per candy ceiling price of cotton was Rs. 820. I think, the ceiling price of basic jarilla might be today Rs. 1100 or 1200. During these 15 years since 1951-52, the raw cotton prices have gone up at the most by 150% whereas the prices of other commodities have increased three times or four times.

The growers are not able to get a fair remunerative price or an incentive prices. Besides this, there is another reason why the growers are put to losses. That is the floor price. Today, there is a wide gap between the floor price and the ceiling price. In 1945-46 the gap was Rs. 130, and in 1948-49 it was Rs. 125, but today I believe—I am speaking subject to correction—that it must be about Rs. 300. Because of the floor price and because there is an artificial crisis, to which I shall come presently, there are wide fluctuations; and on account of these wide fluctuations, the growers get at the most only the floor price and not the ceiling price.

If Government is serious and sincere to solve this problem of short supply of cotton, then I would like to make three suggestions to them for implementation. My first suggestion has already been negatived in the hon. Minister's opening speech. That was that the ceiling price should be abolished. If that is not possible, then I would submit that at least for 1967-68 the ceiling price should be raised by at least 25 per cent, and further, by 50 per cent; the gap between the floor price and the ceiling price should not exceed Rs. 100.

Shri Shivaji Rao D. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Rs. 50.

Shri Rane: All right, it should not exceed Rs. 50. I stand corrected by my hon. friend. But the gap should never exceed that. On account of the wide gap, fluctuations take place, and then nobody else suffers except the growers. During these 25 years of the control policy, I submit that the growers of cotton have suffered to the tune of several crores of rupees while the industry had made tons of rupees or tons of money or tons of currency notes.

Coming to the Bill which seeks to replace the Ordinance, I would submit that the ordinance has been necessitated because there was a crisis in the textile industry. As regards this crisis, I want to submit that it is an artificially created crisis. This is not a new thing this year only. If the hon. Minister examines the position from 1962 till today, he would find that it is an annual phenomenon, namely that the prices tend to rise in November or December and immediately the harsh hand of the Textile Commissioner comes in....

Shri Sonavane: That is the usual feature.

Shri Rane: He steps in, and he does so even when the prices are below the ceiling and when they are just near the ceiling, and then the markets are closed for months sometimes, and the fate of the growers is that they get the lowest price.

If the hon. Minister wants to avoid all these things, then he should seriously consider the question of reducing the gap between the floor price and the ceiling price. This is the most important thing. As I have already submitted, he should also consider the question of raising the ceiling prices. Of course, he has committed himself by saying that abolition of control is not possible; I quite understand that he cannot do so immediately, but I would submit that the question needs to be looked into.

So, these are my suggestions, namely that the ceiling price should be raised by at least 25 per cent during the coming year and 50 per cent from the next year onwards.

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : सभापति महोदय, मैं यह समझता हूं कि जब इस सदन् के सामने यह सुझाव आया था कि सूती कपड़ा मिल उद्योग में जो रूई की वजह से संकट की परिस्थिति उत्पन्न हुई है उस को किस तरीके से सुलझाया जाय तो मैं समझता हूं कि यह कह देना जैसा कि स्टेटमैंट में माननीय मंत्री ने कहा है कि उन्होंने सब से पूछ लिया था और पूछने के बाद ही कुछ ऐसे सुझाव आये हैं जिस से मजदूरों को तक्लीफ़ कम हो जायेगी मैं समझता हूं कि जब हम लोग उन से मिले थे तो एक बात कम से कम मेरी तरफ से या मेरे मित्र श्री डांगे जो कि आल इंडिया ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस के जनरल सेक्रेटरी हैं उन की तरफ से साफ तरीके से कह दिया गया था कि आल इण्डिया ट्रेड यूनियन कांग्रेस इस बात की मुखालफ़त करती है और मजम्मत करती है कि एक दिन या एक घंटा भी कारखाने बंद नहीं होने चाहिए सिवाय इतवार के क्योंकि सभापति महोदय इस से पहले जब 15 दिन ब्लौक क्लोजर की बात आई थी उस वक्त श्री मनुभाई शाह मंत्री होते थे और उन्होंने कहा कि ऐसा नहीं होगा बल्कि हम एक दिन बन्द करेंगे हफ्ते में और 15 दिन तकरीबन-तकरीबन आज तक बन्द हो चुकी हैं। उस वक्त भी हम ने यह कहा था कि अगर आप बन्द करना चाहते हैं तो मजदूरों को तनख्वाहें और ऐलाउन्सेंज मिलने चाहियें। मैं आप से निवेदन करूं कि 15 दिन में जो एक दिन बन्द हुआ करता है तो उस में जितने भी सब्स्टीच्यूट्स हैं या बदली हैं उन को तनख्वाह नहीं मिला करती है जोकि इस बिल में है कि बदली को नहीं मिला करेगा। वह अच्छी बात है उस का मैं स्वागत करता हूं लेकिन आज जितनी तनख्वाह मिलती है जिसको कि ले औफ कम्पेंसेशन कहते हैं 45 दिन से ज्यादा कानून के अन्तर्गत मिलता नहीं है। इस के लिए मैं कहूंगा कि पहले तो इस की जांच होनी चाहिये कि वाकई में देश की रूई का संकट इतना है या नहीं है जिसके कि फलस्वरूप कारखाने बन्द होने की नौबत हो रही है। मैं समझता हूं कुछ ऐसे हाउसेज हैं कुछ ग्रुप्स हैं बिड़लाज रूईयाज वगैरह जिन्होंने कि काफ़ी रुई इकट्ठा कर के रख छोड़ी है। मैं समझता हू कि आज अगर सरकार में हिम्मत है हमारे नये मंत्री हैं नौजवान हैं वह हिम्मत से काम लें और हिम्मत से अगर काम लें कौटन बेल्स रिक्वीजीशन करें, इन मैगनैट्स के गुदामों में जाकर पता लगायें कि क्या वहां पर रूई की गांठें पड़ी हुई हैं। छोटे कारखाने बड़ों की वजह से परेशान हैं और ऐसी नौबत आ गई है कि कारखाने बन्द होते जा रहे हैं तो इसका कोई उपाय है क्या? कहा जाता है कि इस वक्त हमारे सामने और कोई सुझाव नहीं है बजाय इस के कि हर शनिवार को बन्द हो महीने में केवल दो शनिवार बन्द की जा सकें यह रिआयत के रूप में उन्होंने ऐलान किया है। लेकिन मैं महसूस करता हूं कि आज भी किसी आदमी से पूछा जाय जिन्हें इस का ज्ञान हो, चाहे इधर का हो या उधर से हो, वह भी कहेगा कि सही तरीके में अगर इस की जांच हो कि क्या वाकई में कुछ कौटन मैगनैट्स ने कौटन व बेल्स का स्टोरैज कर रक्खा है, क्या वाकई में उन्होंने अपने गुदामों में भर रक्खा हैं या नहीं, अगर इस बात का फैसला हो जाय तो मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि एक घंटे के लिए भी कारखानों को बन्द करने की जरूरत नहीं होगी। मैं इस की मुखालफत करता हूं और कारखाने बन्द नहीं होने चाहिए। मजदूरों के कुर्बानी करने की बात अगर आती है तो मैं कहूंगा कि अगर मिलमालिकों ने इतना मुनाफा कमाया है तो हमें भी उस का कुछ हिस्सा दिया जाय। मैं भी उसी नगर का रहने वाला हूं जिस को कि मैनचेस्टर औफ इंडिया कहा जाता था यानी कानपुर। वहां पर काफी कारखाने हैं। वहां पर रूई की ज्यादा जरूरत

[श्री म०मो० बनर्जी]

है और वह इसलिए है कि मीडियम या कोर्स क्लाथ वहां पर बनता है । फाईन और सुपर फाईन कपड़ा बनाने में रूई की खपत कम ही होती है मीडियम और कोर्स क्लाथ कम रूई में बन जाता है । हमारे सामने जो मसला है कानपुर में वह यह कि उन कारखानों में मोटा कपड़ा बनता है । मोटे कपड़े की खपत हमारे देश में उतनी भी नहीं हो रही है और हमारा ऐक्सपोर्ट के बारे में भी मार्केट नहीं है क्योंकि चीन और दूसरे लोगों ने किसी तरीके से मार्केट कैप्चर कर दिया है, हम सोते रह गये और उन्होंने हमारा मार्केट कैप्चर कर लिया तो हमें देखना है उन को किस तरीके से चलना है ?

कारखानों के बारे में कहा जाता है कि ज्यादा कारखाने बन्द हो जायेंगे । मेरे मित्र श्री शांति लाल शाह जिन्हें इस उद्योग का काफी तजुर्बा है उन्होंने कहा है कि ब्लौक क्लोजर 14 दिन का कर दिया जाय और मजदूर उस में अपनी छुट्टी ले ले । अब 14 दिन उसे मुश्किल से छुट्टी मिलती है । उसे घर जाना है, उस की सेहत खराब हो जाती है, उसे अपना इलाज कराना होता है, इन त्रुटियों को इसलिये वह लगा दे ताकि सरमायेदारों का मुनाफा बढ़ जाय मैं समझता हूं कि मजदूर सरमायेदारों के लिए और ज्यादा कुर्बानी करने को तैयार नहीं है और न हम उस को कुर्बान होने देंगे । सवाल होता है कि किया क्या जाय ? मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जिस तरीके से एक दफ़ा इस सदन् में बहस भी हुई थी और काफी मैम्बरों ने अपनी सम्मति प्रकट की थी और उन्होंने कहा था कि एक टैक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन सरकार क्यों नहीं बना देती ? टेक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन बना कर उन कारखानों को ले लिया जाय । मैं आप से निवेदन करता हूं कि यह जो कारखानेदार कहते हैं कि कारखाने चल नहीं रहे हैं, कारखाना मालिकान चलाना नहीं चाहते हैं और वह इसलिए है कि वहां पर जो मिस्मैनेजमेंट है उसे वह नहीं चाहते हैं कि वह इन्वैस्टिगेट हो जाय । सरकार अपने हाथों में कारखाने ले और दो, तीन साल तक सरकार अपना पैसा उस में बहाये और पैसा बहाने के बाद जब मुनाफा होने लग जायेगा, कारखाने के मालिकान को कहा जायेगा कि लीजिये हमने यह कारखाना ऐसा कर दिया कि इस में मुनाफा हो रहा है, आप अब इस को ले जाइये । यही चीज सूती कपड़ा मिलों के बारे में, शक्कर मिलों के बारे में होती आ रही हैं । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आज से कुछ दिन पहले साल भर पहले कानपुर की म्योर मिल जोकि एक बहुत बड़ा कारखाना है उस मिल को अचानक बन्द कर दिया गया मालिकान ने यह कहा कि हमारे पास साधनों को कमी है, पैसे की कमी है हमें 60 लाख (?) रुपया दो वरना यह कारखाना नहीं चलेगा और उनके कारखाने को अचानक बन्द कर देने से 6 हजार मजदूर बेकार हो गये । मैं धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं उस व्यक्ति को जोकि हमारे बीच में नहीं है, स्वर्गीय श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री, जिन्होंने हिम्मत से काम लिया, हौसले से काम लिया । उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार को कहा कि उस कारखाने को ले लेना चाहिए । एक ऐथोराइज्ड कंट्रोलर नियुक्त होने के बाद 6 महीने के अन्दर कारखाने में जितना भी नुकसान हो रहा था वह नुकसान मुनाफे में बदल गया और आज मजदूरों को वहां बोनस भी मिल रहा है । इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि इस के बारे में एक जांच बैठानी चाहिए, जांच कमेटी होनी चाहिए कि रूई का वितरण किस तरीके से किया जाय । आप इम्पोर्ट करेंगे लेकिन जितनी भी इम्पोर्ट करेंगे उस रूई का आमतौर पर वितरण कहां होगा ? वह भी बिड़लाज के पास चली जायगी, रूईयाज के पास चली जायगी और वह भी दूसरे मैगनैट्स के पास चली

जायगी और हमारी जो छोटी यूनिट्स हैं वह उन के सामने नहीं टिक पायगीं ।

मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि यह टैक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन बनाने में हिम्मत की जरूरत होगी । टेक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन अगर बनायेंगे तो मैं जानता हूं कि टैक्सटाइल मिल मैगनैट्स जिन्होंने कि काफी मदद सत्ता दल के लोगों की की है इस चुनाव में वह इस का विरोध करेंगे । वह कहेंगे कि हमारे कारखानों को न लिया जाय लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि टेक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन अगर आज बन जाय इन्हीं कारखानों को लेकर तो उस में मुनाफा होगा और वह कारखाने चलेंगे । लाइफ इंश्योरेंस के काम को भी हम ने कारपोरेशन के रूप में ले लिया लोगों ने कहा था कि यह चलेगा नहीं, बीमा व्यवसाय अगर राष्ट्रीय उद्योग में आ जायगा तो उस में नुकसान होगा लेकिन क्या बीमा कारपोरेशन हमारा चल नहीं रहा है ? मेरे मित्र मंत्री महोदय में अगर हिम्मत है और सरकार यदि सचमुच में चाहती है कि यह देश समाजवादी दिशा में चले यह उद्योग हमारा कुछ अच्छा हो तो ऐसा कर देना चाहिए ।

सभापति महोदय, एक छोटा सा इशारा मैं यह करना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरीके से मिस्मैनेजमैंट कंसर्नस् में है वह हमारी आंखों के सामने है, श्री राम रतन गुप्ता की लक्ष्मी रतन कौटन मिल्स जिसकी कि बाबत सवाल मैं ने इस सदन् के सामने बार-बार उठाया उस में आज भी 5000 मजदूर बेकार हैं, दस महीने से बेकार हैं । हमारी उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने जबकि हमारी बहन श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी वहां पर मुख्य मंत्री थीं उन्होंने कहा था कि हम ने केन्द्रीय सरकार से सिफारिश कर दी है और उस का इन्वेस्टिगेशन हो जायेगा । श्री मनुभाई शाह ने इन्वेस्टिगेशन किया और इन्वेस्टिगेशन की रिपोर्ट में यह कहा गया कि इस कारखाने को सरकार ले ले । इस कारखाने के मालिक श्री राम रतन गुप्ता साहब जोकि एक बहुत बड़े सरमायेदार हैं, किसी का पैसा वह देते नहीं हैं, यानी मैं कहना चाहता हूं नौन पेमेंट आफ गवर्नमेंट रैवैन्यु, घिसाई का पैसा उन्होंने नहीं दिया । प्राविडेंट फंड का पैसा नहीं दिया, बोनस का पैसा नहीं दिया और अपने कारखाने को उन्होंने मोर्टगेज कर दिया 12 लाख रुपये में । किस के पास मोर्टगेज किया ? वह अपनी ही जो बम्बई में बी० आर० कौटन मिल्स है उसे मोर्टगेज कर दिया । इस तरीके से जो लोग फ्रौड कर रहे हैं, जो चीट कर रहे हैं, वह जेल में नहीं गये । उनके चैक्स डिस्ओनर होते जा रहे हैं लेकिन आज भी उन को दो महीने का समय दिया जा रहा है । मैं श्री दिनेश सिंह से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि वह हिम्मत करें इस बात की कि इस कारखाने को अपने हाथ में ले लें जिस की कि जांच हो चुकी है । लेकिन हालत यह है कि जब श्री सी०बी० गुप्ता की उत्तर प्रदेश में मिनिस्टरी हो गई तो श्री राम रतन गुप्ता डंके की चोट पर कहने लग गये कि हमारा क्या हो सकता है ? अब तो श्री सी० बी० गुप्ता आगये हैं हमारे कारखाने को कोई नहीं ले सकता है लेकिन अब तो वहां दूसरी सरकार आ गई है और मैं चाहता हूं कि इन्वेस्टिगेटिंग कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है उस को सदन् के पटल पर रखना चाहिए क्योंकि उस में साफ तरीके से कहा गया है कि उन्होंने चीट किया है और आज भी 6 हजार मजदूर दस महीने से बेकार हैं । उन्हें ले औफ़ कम्पेंसेशन नहीं मिला, प्राविडेंट का पैसा नहीं मिला और जो बीमार मजदूर हो जाते हैं उनकी दवा का पैसा भी उन्होंने जमा नहीं किया है, घिसाई का पैसा भी उन्होंने जमा नहीं किया है यहां तक कि बिजली के बिल का 1 लाख 35 हजार रुपया भी उन पर बकाया है और वह भी उन्होंने आज तक नहीं दिया है । एक चैक दिया वह भी डिस्ओनर हो गया है । बजाय इस के कि मजदूरों को कुर्बान किया जाय इस मामले में कि उन्होंने कुछ

[श्री स० मो० बनर्जी]

इस्तिवाल अंगेज बातें कर दी मैं समझता हूं कि श्री राम रतन गुप्ता की कुर्बानी होनी चाहिये।

लेकिन दिनेश सिंह जी की चिट्ठी जब मुझे मिली तो उसको देख कर मैं दंग रह गया। उन्होंने कहा कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने कोई वादा ही नहीं किया था और न लेने की कोई इच्छा प्रकट की थी। हमारी भूतपूर्व मुख्य मंत्री श्रीमती सुचेता कृपलानी यहां पर हैं उनसे पूछा जाय। वहां फाइल्स में नोट है कि आइन्दा ले लेते हम यह कारखाने हमारी बदकिस्मती है कि गुप्त जी जब मुख्य मंत्री नहीं रहे और उनका मंत्रीमंडल खत्म हो गया तो जितनी फाइलें थीं उनको लोगों ने रिक्शों और मोटरों में भर कर बाहर निकालना शुरू कर दिया।

श्री सी० एम० केडारिया : (मांडवी); जो सही बात है वह कहिए। इरेलिवेन्ट बात मत कहिये।

श्री स० मो० बनर्जी : मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि अगर लक्ष्मी रतन कारखाने को सरकार नहीं ले सकती है तो यह उस की कमजोरी है। यह बात जरूर है कि चुनाव में चूंकि उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश कांग्रेस कमेटी की काफ़ी मदद की थी और आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी की थी, इस लिये उन का हाथ कांप जाते हैं। मैं दुबारा निवेदन करूंगा कि यह 6,000 मजदूरों का सवाल है, यह भुख-मरी से पीड़ित हैं और दस महीने से उन के फाकाकसी करने की नौबत आ गई है। भगवान न करे अगर उन का कोई बच्चा मर जाये तो बिना कफन के ही उस का जनाजा उठ जायेगा। इस लिये इस कारखानों को लिया जाये और टेक्स्टाइल कारपोरेशन जरूर बनना चाहिये और इतना सब कुछ होते हुए भी मैं वेज कट की मुखालिफ़त करता हूं।

श्री के० जी० देशमुख (अमरावती) : सभापति महोदय, जो बिल लाया गया है आम तौर पर मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूं क्योंकि जो मिलें बन्द होने वाली हैं उनको चालू रखने के लिये लाया गया है। लेकिन मैं इस के साथ दो एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूं।

जैसा हमारे श्री राणे ने बतलाया और जो भाषण मैं ने सुने, उन में केवल मिल-मालिकों और मजदूरों की बात कही गई है। मजदूरों के बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है क्योंकि उन को पैसा मिलना ही चाहिये और मिलें चालू रहनी ही चाहियें। मिल वालों ने दो एक सुझाव रक्खे हैं, और श्री चटर्जी साहब ने भी कहा, कि मिल वालों की कुछ मदद करो क्योंकि मिलों पर आलरेडी पहले से बहुत बर्डन है। अगर मजदूरों को वह पैसा देंगे तो शायद मिलें बन्द हो जायें। पिछले दस पंदरह सालों से हम देख रहे हैं और इनकम टैक्स की स्टेटिस्टिक्स देखने से पता चलता है कि कितना पैसा उन लोगों ने कमाया है। वह सिर्फ मजदूरों का नाम ले कर काश्तकारों को हमेशा कत्ल करना चाहते हैं।

श्री सी० एम० केडारिया : सही बात है।

श्री के० जी० देशमुख : मजदूरों को बोनस भी देना चाहिये और तनख्वाह भी देनी चाहिये और इस से मिल वालों पर कोई प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा, लेकिन मजदूरों के नाम पर काश्तकारों कितना कत्ल हो रहा है इस को राणे साहब ने बतलाया है। पिछले दस सालों में कपड़े की कीमत मिल वालों ने कम से कम तिगुनी और चौगुनी बढ़ा दी है। लेकिन अगर कपास की कीमतों को देखा जाये तो सिरफ 840 रु० से लेकर 1130 रु० तक ही बढ़ी हैं यानी सर्फ 30 परसेंट बढ़ी हैं। काश्तकारों को कपड़ा लेना पड़ता है। जब वह कपास बेचता है तो उस से कपड़ा बनता है

जिस के लिये उस को तिगुणा और चौगुना दाम देना पड़ता है जब कि कपास का पूरा पैसा उस को नहीं मिलता है । अभी कई कई मित्रों ने बतलाया, शायद वह स्वतन्त्र पार्टी के होंगे कि क्लाथ का जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन रहता है उस में कपास का 50 फी सदी हिस्सा रहता है । में दावे के साथ कह सकता हूं कि अगर आप एक गज कपड़ा लें तो उस में 20 फी सदी से ज्यादा कपास का हिस्सा नहीं रहता है । लेकिन कपास के दाम पर उन्होंने कीमतें बढ़ा दी हैं । आखिर काश्तकार लोग क्या करें ?

दूसरी बात यह है कि टैक्स्टाइल कमिश्नर के नाम से एक बड़ा अफसर बम्बई में रहता है और वही इस सारे उद्योग को कण्ट्रोल करता है । मैंने पिछले दस पन्द्रह सालों में देखा है जो भी काटन की पालिसी बनती है या क्लाथ पालिसी बनती है, वह बम्बई में बनती है और जो भी कंट्रोल होता है वह वहीं से होता है । आप कपास के कंट्रोल को देखिये । हमारी फलोर प्राइस और सीलिंग प्राइस में एक खंडी पर 100 रु० का फर्क है लेकिन जब भी व्यापारी लेता है वह कभी भी सीलिंग प्राइस नहीं देता है । इस साल भी नहीं मिली है । मिनिस्टर साहब ने स्वयम कबूल किया है कि पिछले दो सालों से कपास की कमी के कारण क्लाथ का प्रोडक्शन कम हो रहा है और इस लिये सीलिंग प्राइस गिरी है । इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स को हमें सीलिंग प्राइस देना भी अच्छा नहीं लगता है और न वह दी जा रही है, इस लिये कि जो भी पालिसी बन रही है, जो भी पालिसी टेक्स्टाइल कमिश्नर बनाते हैं वह मिल वालों के इशारे पर बनाते हैं । ऐसा मेरा ख्याल है । हमारी कपास का दाम गिरता जाता है इस लिये काश्तकार चिल्लाते हैं । हम काश्तकारों को क्या मिला है । सीलिंग प्राइस के ऊपर सिर्फ 5 फी सदी, जब कि हम को कपड़ा दुगुनी और चौगनी कीमत पर मिल रहा है । जो 5 फी सदी हमको मिल रहा है वह भी टेक्स्टाइल कमिश्नर की सलाह के ऊपर ।

इस के अलावा जो दूसरे प्रकार के कंट्रोल हैं उन को भी आप देखिये । जहां भी थोड़ा कपास का दाम सीलिंग तक आ गया फौरन उस के मूवमैंट पर कंट्रोल कर दिया जाता है । बरार की कपास खानदेश की कपास गुजरात नहीं जाने दी जाती है । आखिर क्या बात है ? इस साल भी उस का फ्री मूवमैंट नहीं है । उस को वहां क्यों नहीं जाना चाहिये ? अगर गुजरात में हमारी कपास जाती है तो क्या वह हिन्दुस्तान से बाहर जा रही है ? हमेशा जोनल रेस्ट्रिक्शन आ जाते हैं और इसी लिये कपास की कीमत गिर जाती है । कुछ रिक्विजिशन हो रही है । नतीजा क्या होता है कि सीलिंग प्राइस खानदेश और बरार में कम हो रही है, वह काश्तकारों को मिल नहीं रही है, जो कि मिलनी चाहिये और गुजरात में कपास की कीमत बढ़ रही हैं, मेरे पास तार आया है जिस की कापी मेरे पास है । लेकिन फिर भी आप मिल वालों को प्रोटेक्शन देते हैं । काश्तकारों से अपील की जा रही है मिनिस्टर साहब ने भी अपिल की है कि काश्तकारों को कपास का उत्पादन बढ़ाना चाहिये, लेकिन उन को आप खाने को तो दीजिये, पेट तो उन का भरना चाहिये । मैं अपील करना चाहता हूं कि फ्लोर प्राइस और सीलिंग प्राइस में कम से कम 50 प्रतिशत का फर्क होना चाहिये । फ्लोर प्राइस भी बढ़नी चाहिये । टेक्स्टाइल कमिश्नर को हिदायत दी जानी चाहिये कि वह काश्तकारों के हित को भी देखे, खाली मिल वालों के कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन को ही न देखे ।

Shri Umanath: Mr. Chairman, Sir, first, I would like to demolish the argument of Shri Dinesh Singh when he said that the present crisis is due to the fact that textile production has increased to such an extent that cotton production is not able to cope with it. That was the explanation he made and to prove his case, he quoted certain figures of textile production, expansion, spindleage and all those things.

[Shri Umanath]

To say the least, I would like to say this is misleading the House, because cloth production, for example has been declining: in 1964, it was 465 crore metres; it had fallen to 459 crore metres in 1965 and to 424 crore metres in 1966. Is it not a decline in the recent years? Take the question of spindleage. The Minister gives the installed capacity; that is a very cunning method of doing it. Actually, one must take the utilised spindleage; if we take the utilised spindleage into account, it was 13.5 million in 1965; it had fallen to 13.2 million in 1966. Again, does it not show a fall in trend in textile production? So, the truth is that textile production has been declining and the Government has failed to make cotton available to the industry even for its declining production. This is the truth which Shri Dinesh Singh is trying to cover up by jugglery of figures.

Is the cotton stock position in the country so bad as to necessitate a weekly closure of mills envisaged in this Bill? Shri Dinesh Singh asked me whether I was glad, since he has now reduced the closure of two days per week to one day per week. It is just like asking a man, who is condemning to two strips by the wnip earlier, and whose punishment is reduced to one stripe, "Are you not happy now?" It is just like that.

My case is, todays's cotton stock position in the country is not such as to warrant any closure all the year round; it can run through. I will give you the figures given by the Indian Cotton Mills Federation. It has given its assessment of the cotton capacity in the country in the latest issue of the *Eastern Economist*. It says that the carry-over of the cotton stock, making allowance for the export and other things, was 2·5 million bales as on 1st April, 1967. I am giving the figures published in the *Eastern Economist*. 2:5 million bales mean, if you take the monthly requirement as five lakhs to six lakhs, whatever it is, even if they keep up their minimum guarantee of production, there is cotton available for more than two months' production. This is according to the calculation of the Indian Cotton Mills Federation.

So, when that is the position, what is the truth about availability? Cotton is available, but is cornered by speculators and big magnates of the textile industry. Government refuses to seize it and distribute it. Instead, Government compels the workers to give up their wages and compels the consumers to pay more for cloth. Government claims that its action in December, 1966 has slightly improved the situation. But it is not so. The average cotton consumption in 1966 was 4,92,000 bales. But after the Government's action, in January 1967 it was 4,50,000 and in February it was 4,18,000 bales. Where is the improvement? In fact, availability of cotton has shrunk further.

Take the ceiling and market prices. Government says that after its action, market prices ruled at about the ceiling prices and there was some improvement. That is not a fact. I am again quoting from *Eastern Economist* dated 16th March, 1967:

	Ceiling Price	*Market Price*
Gujrat CO_2	1735	2400
AK 235 and 277	1300	1655 to 1550
Digvijay (baluj)	1478	1650 to 1700
PA 32OF	1244	1330 to 1350

I have got figures for a number of varieties, but I have no time. When there is a crisis in the textile industry, they are violating the ceiling prices fixed by Government and openly selling at higher prices. This was the position in January and February, after the Government's action. Where is the imrpovement? They get the workers handy to rob them of their wages and they do not care about the ceiling prices at all.

After requisitioning of surplus stocks, Government claim to have

taken some action. When mills want some stocks from the requisitioned stocks, the must deposit Rs. 25 per bale. Government have collected deposits for 75,000 bales, but the actual quantity requisitioned—not what you have frozen in Bombay port—is only 5000 bales. The *Eastern Economist* confirms this:

"The Government has simply failed both to make cotton available to the mills and to enforce the ceiling prices thereof. Today, if any mill wants the Government to requisition cotton for it, it has to deposit Rs. 25 per bale. It is understood that total deposits made thus relate to no less than 75,000 bales, but the Government does not appear to have requisitioned anything more than 5,000 bales."

Even in this critical situation, the Government is not prepared to ban forward trading. In reply to a question, Mr. Dinesh Singh said, "even as it is, there are certain restrictions on forward trading". But notwithstnding the restrictions, there is a crisis and cotton is not available, though the stocks are there in the country. What is the use of your imposing restrictions now, when you should ban forward trading? Instead of trying to resolve the crisis by doing all these things, Government would try to resolve it by increasing the cloth and yarn prices and hit the people and resort to deduction in wages to hit the workers. This means, according to the Government, cotton traders and textile magnates have the right to corner and to sell above the ceiling prices and the speculators shall have the right to do forward trading and indulge in speculation. But the worker will have his right to full employment curtailed and the public will have its right to get cheap cloth curtailed.

Our mill-owners also do not ask the Govermnent to touch the speculator. They say, let him have it, but let me also take advantage of it. They want scaling down of excise duty, tax relief and money for rationalisation and control, as though if they are given money for modernisation, they will give cheap cloth to the consumers. Already Rs. 300 crores have been given to them in 6 years. Yet they are trying to take advantage of the position and of the Government's refusal to get stocks from the speculators, and the textile magnates, so that they can have their own part in the loot.

In conclusion, my submission to the Government is, withdraw the provisions of the Bill, excepting the one preventing closure without Government's permission.

We also demand that you should stop export of cotton at this juncture, ban worward trading, you should confiscate surplus and cornered stocks and distribute them to needy mills, you should procure cotton direct from growers and distribute, you should give financial assistance to needy mills and you should have a permanent machinery to keep a watch on mills finances. You should prevent closure and provide for expeditious taking over of the mills that are closed. I do not think the Government will do it, because the Government themselves are connected with the speculators and millowners or textile magnites. You will not do it. If you will not do it, the people will compel you to do it.

Shri K. N. Pandey: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am really thankful to the hon. Minister because he has realised the gravity of the situation. This crisis did not arise at the time when he took over charge of this Ministry, it has been there since long.

But we have to look at this problem from two angles. There are certain things which in my view have led to such a crisis where the labour are suffering, the factories are suffering and the Government is also suffering because it has lost several lakhs of rupees in excise duties due to less production. Therefore, we have to consider the problem very seriously.

[Shri K. N. Pandey]

First of all, it is true that because of failure of rains there has been a short fall in production resulting in shortage of raw cotton in the country. Moreover, Govermet also tried its best to minimise imports. After all, it involves foreign exchange. Moreover, how long can we depend on imports.

Mr. Chairman: Please speak within the scope of the Bill.

Shri K. N. Pandey: I am coming to that and then I will give my suggestions. In the meanwhile I want to draw the attention of the Ministry to one thing. Only when the problem arises they issue some ordinance and then the crisis starts. It requires deep consideration. The production of raw cotton was 2.97 million in 1951 and it went up to 5.4 million upto 1964. Similarly, imports came down from 1.1 million to .64 million. But the consumption of yarn and cloth went up from 3.8 million to 6.2 million. Now the consumption increases but the production of raw cotton decreases. Similarly, spindleage and also looms were increased. Before granting licenses for these spinning mills and looms to be installed, they should have taken this fact into consideration whether they would be able to supply sufficient cotton or yarn to meet their requirements. This was not taken into consideration at all This is also one of the causes why this problem has arisen.

I am happy to say that the hon. Minister, while speaking, said that they were going to put some restriction on addition of more spindleage. But it will not serve any puropse if you only put restriction on that. You have to put restriction on the looms also.

18 hrs.

I want to give one or two suggestions. I am making this suggestion to this Ministry because this closure of one day in a wek was done by this Ministry and not by the Labour Ministry—otherwise I would have suggested this to the Ministry of Labour. This Ministry in consultation with the Labour Ministry should call a tripartite conference to consider whether it is desirable to have the closure for some days at one time or one day in a week because it is causing more hardship.

The other suggestion is the stoppage or increasing the member of looms in future till the position becomes normal Thirdly, a machinery should be evolved by the Ministry which will ensure that the distribution of cotton between the mills is even. This problem should not be tackled only on emergency basis but the Government have to take steps to see how the problem could be solved on a long term basis.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर): सभापति महोदय जो विधेयक हमारे सामने आया है, असल में वह रद्दी की टोकरी में फेंकने लायक है, क्योंकि इस के द्वारा कोई अच्छा मक़सद हल नहीं हो पा रहा है। इस के उद्देश्यों में कहा गया है :

> "With a view to conserving cotton and ensuring a more orderly and equitable distribution of the limited supplies available and prevention of unemployment, it was essential to secure a reduction in machine activity. This was sought to be achieved through a scheme of compulsory closure of textile mills for one additional day per week."

पहले तो में माननीय मंत्री से यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या इस अधिनियम पर पिछले कुछ महीनों में हिन्दुस्तान के सभी कोनों में अमल हुआ है। क्या यह सही है कि कानपुर म पदमपत सिंहानिया की मिलें सप्ताह म छः दिन बराबर चलती रही और पंजाब में भी कई मिलें ऐसी हैं, जिन्होंने इस अधिनियम का जरा भी परवाह नहीं की और बराबर छः दिन तक उन का काम चलता रहा ? असल में जब सरकार कोई अधिनियम जारी करती

है तो उसको इस सदन को इस बात से अवगत करना चाहिए कि क्या उस पर अमल हो रहा है या नहीं ?

सरकार ने रूई का दाम इस आशा से पांच प्रतिशत बढ़ाया कि नये दाम पर सारी रूई कपड़े के पैदावार के लिए मिल जायेगी लेकिन जैसाकि ईस्टर्न इकानोमिस्ट और कामर्स आदि अखबारों में आ चुका है, रूई के लगभग जो सभी प्रकार है उनका दाम नियंत्रित दाम से अधिक है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि यह जो नियंत्रित दाम से अधिक दाम मिल रहा है, वह किन लोगों को मिल रहा है ? यह बात सही है कि जो पैदा करने वाला किसान है उस को यह दाम नहीं मिल रहा है बल्कि जमाखोर लोगों और बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपति लोगों की मिलों को मिल रहा है जिनमें बिड़ला साम्राज्य की मिलें भी हैं। उन के पास आठ आठ महीनों का स्टाक पड़ा हुआ है। हो सकता है कि मिल का जो कम्पाउंड या प्रांगण है उस में वह स्टाक न मिले। वह स्टाक उन्होंने कुछ व्यापारियों और कुछ बड़े काश्तकारों के पास रखा हुआ है। असल में वह रूई है बिड़ला मिलों की, लेकिन वह रखी हुई है किसी अन्य जगह। नियंत्रित दाम से ज्यादा दाम पर रूई बेची जाती है उस का फ़ायदा किसानों को नहीं, बल्कि जमाखोरों और बिड़ला जैसे बड़े पूंजीपतियों की मिलों को मिल रहा है।

यह जो सीलिंग दाम नियंत्रण हैं, यह तो एक मजाक है, क्योंकि सरकार ने औद्योगिक विकास कानून के मातहत जिन मिलों को अपने कब्जे में लिया है, खुद उन के व्यवस्थापक नियंत्रित दाम से अधिक दाम देकर रूई खरीद रहे हैं। अगर मंत्री महोदय मेरी बात को काट सकते हैं, तो वह काटें, लेकिन मेरे पास जानकारी है कि खुद सरकार ने जिन मिलों को अपने हाथ में लिया है, वे अधिक दाम देकर रुई खरीद रही है। इसीलिये मैंने कहा है, यह सीलिंग वगैरह एक मजाक है।

मेरी दरख्वास्त है कि इस साल जिस किसी के पास रुई का स्टाक हो, उसको नियंत्रित दाम से हाथ में ले लिया जाये क्योंकि वह अधिकतर बड़ी मिल वालों और जमाखोरों के पास हैं। लेकिन अगले मौसम में किसानों को अधिक दाम का फायदा दिलाने के लिये सरकार नीचे वाले नियंत्रण अर्थात् फ्लोर प्राइस को तो रखे लेकिन किसानों को जिस से तकलीफ होती है, वह सीलिंग बिल्कुल हटा दी जाये, क्योंकि उस से जमाखोरी बढ़ रही है और उससे कोई फायदा नहीं हो रहा है। मैं इस साल के लिये नहीं कह रहा हूं क्योंकि इस साल तो किसानों के पास रुई है नहीं—वह केवल जमाखोरों और बड़ी मिल वालों के पास है। इसलिये इस साल का स्टाक नियंत्रित दाम से ले लिया जाये और अगले साल कोई सीलिंग न रखी जाये ताकि किसानों को फायदा हो।

सरकार ने अभी तक रुई के स्टाक को अपने हाथ में लेने के लिये कुछ नहीं किया है। इतना ही नहीं, टैक्सटाइल कमिश्नर के कार्यालय ने रिश्वतखोरी कर के इधर की रुई उधर भेजने के लिये ट्रांसपोर्ट सर्टिफिकेट दे रखे हैं। सरकार जब भी कोई नया नियंत्रण लगाती है, तो उसका फायदा केवल इन भ्रष्टाचारी अधिकारियों को ही होता है। वे ज्यादा पैसा खाने लगते हैं।

भूतपूर्व व्यापार मंत्री के कई रैकट चलते थे, जिन में से एक एक्सपोर्ट प्रोमोशन स्कीम, आयात प्रोत्साहन योजना, भी था। इण्डोनेशिया और दूसरे देशों को कपड़ा भेजने की योजना बनाई गई थी और जो घाटा होता था, उसको पूरा करने के लिये उन्होंने क्या किया ? जो रुई आयात की जाती थी, उन्होंने काटन मिल ओनर्ज फेडेरेशन को उस पर फीस, लैवी लगाने का अधिकार दिया। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने यह कहा है कि पार्लियामेंट की इजाजत के बिना इस तरह का टैक्स लगाने का काटन मिल ओनर्ज फेडेरेशन को कोई अधिकार नहीं था। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि

[श्री मधु लिमये]

पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की इस आलोचना की रोशनी में इन मिल फेडरेशन वालों को सजा और दण्ड देने के लिये सरकार ने क्या कदम उठाया है। अगर कोई गैर सरकारी नागरिक, या नागरिकों की संस्था, पूंजी-पतियों की संख्या इस प्रकार गैर-कानूनी ढंग से टैक्स लगाने लगे, तो हम उस बात को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे, क्योंकि उस से घाटा हमारे देश का होता है।

मेरी राय है कि पांच दिन मिल चलाने के नाटक को अब खत्म किया जाये। मैं इस बारे में एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूं। जब यह आर्डिनेंस जारी था तो उस अवधि में किस मिल ने हर महीने कितनी रुई का इस्तेमाल किया, सरकार के पास उसके आंकड़े हैं। सरकार चार पांच महीनों के आंकड़ों के आधार पर हर एक मिल का औसत मासिक रुई का उपभोग यानी इस्तेमाल, ऐवरेज मंथली कन्जम्पशन निकाल ले। सरकार मिलों को सप्ताह में एक दिन जबरन बन्द न रखे, बल्कि मिलों को चलाने की छुट्टी दे। जमाखोरों और बड़े मिल-मालिकों से जो कोटा सरकार लेगी, उसका वितरण मिलों को उनकी ऐवेरेज मन्थली कन्जम्पशन के आधार पर कर दिया जाये। उससे क्या फायदा होगा? उससे यह फायदा हो सकता है—मैं तात्कालिक इलाज बता रहा हूं—कि मिल वाले उन्हीं मशीनों से दो तीन काउंट बढ़ा सकते हैं—अगर आज वे बीस काउंट का सूत निकालते हैं, तो उन्हीं मशीनों से बाइस तेईस या चौबीस काऊंट को निकाल सकते हैं—जिससे उसी रुई से पैदावार ज्यादा होगी और मजदूरों को काम भी ज्यादा मिलेगा। मैं यह मानता हूं कि अगर यह व्यवस्था ज्यादा समय तक चले, तो गुणवत्ता पर असर पड़ेगा। लेकिन चूंकि इस वक्त संकटकाल है इसलिये मेरी दरख्वास्त है कि सरकार एक दिन की जबरन छुट्टी को हटा दे, मिल वालों को पिछले चार पांच महीनों की औसत उपभोग के आधार पर नियंत्रित दाम से रुई बांटे और उनसे कहे कि वे दो तीन काउंट बढ़ा कर पैदावार को भी बढ़ायें और काम को भी बढ़ायें, जिससे बेरोजगारी की नौबत नहीं आयेगी।

सरकार ने विदेशी मुद्रा देकर पाकिस्तान से रुई की पचास हजार बेल्ज खरीदीं। क्या यह सही है कि पाकिस्तान ने यह दिखाया कि वह माल एडन या हांगकांग से भेजा गया है जबकि वास्तव में वह रुई सीधी बम्बई या कलकत्ता आई और उसका दाम रुई के अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दाम से ज्यादा दिया गया? क्या यह सही है कि सरकार ने रुई के अन्त-र्राष्ट्रीय दाम से ज्यादा दाम देकर पाकिस्तान से पचास हजार बेल्ज रुई खरीदी है?

मैं जानना चाहता हूं यह कौन सा व्या-पारी सिद्धांत है जिसके लिये आप यह विदेशी मुद्रा बरबाद कर रहे हैं? क्या वजह है, मिस्र है, सूडान है, पूर्वी अफ्रीका है या दूसरे जो ऐसे दुनियां के देश हैं उन देशों से, क्यों नहीं लेते? अगर विदेशी मुद्रा खर्च करनी ही है और करनी तो पड़ेगी, आयात तो करना पड़ेगा, तो ठीक तरह करो यह पाकिस्तान के साथ जो आप ने करार किया है उस से हमारे देश का घाटा हो रहा है, तो यह चार पांच सुझाव मैंने आप के सामने रखे हैं उस पर आप सोचें। यह जो आयातित रुई पर लेवी वसूल करने का गैर कानूनी काम हुआ जिसकी आलोचना पब्लिक एकाउन्ट्स कमेटी ने की हैं, उस की भी जांच की जाय और संबंधित लोगों को आप दंड देने का, उनके ऊपर जुर्माना लगाने का काम करें।

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Mohan Swarup.

Shri Sonavane: I come from a tex-tile industry State. I should be allowed to speake.

Mr. Chairman: I am calling those members whose names have been given by the party or group leaders. Mr. Mohan Swarup.

श्री मोहन स्वरूप (पीलीभीत) : सभापति महोदय, रोटी कपड़ा और मकान यह जिन्दगी की सबसे आवश्यक वस्तुएं हैं। लेकिन न तो इस देश में रोटी मिल रही है, हजारों आदमी इस वक्त खाने के बिना मर रहे हैं और आज कपड़े की भी चर्चा हमारे यहां है। जैसी कि यह फिगर्स दी हैं मिनिस्टर साहब ने कि मिलों की संख्या बढ़ती जा रही है, 1951 में 378 मिलें थीं, 1966 में 514 हो गईं और यह भी बताया कि 6.6 मिलियन बेल्स हर साल हमारे लिये चाहिएं तो मैं समझता हूं कि इस तरह से बाहर से रुई मंगा कर अगर हम अपने कारखानों को चलाना चाहते हैं या कपड़ा बनाना चाहते हैं तो यह बहुत मुश्किल बात है। और इसका हल सोचना चाहिए। इसका हल केवल यही हो सकता है कि जिस तरह से खाद्यान्न के बारे में हम आत्म निर्भर होने की बात सोचते हैं उसी प्रकार रुई के बारे में भी आत्मनिर्भरता लानी चाहिये। हमारे देश में कई ऐसे राज्य हैं जहां कि रुई काफी पैदा होती है; जैसे गुजरात है, मध्य प्रदेश है या इधर आंध्र की तरफ भी और यू० पी० में भी कपास काफ़ी पैदा हो सकता है अगर कोशिश की जाय। तो मैं समझता हूं कि जब तक कि हमारे पास रा मैटीरियल नहीं किसी काम को चलाते रहने की क्षमता हम में अधिक नहीं रह जायगी। इसलिये जहां एक तरफ मालिकों की बात कही गई, मजदूरों की बात कही गई वहां किसानों के बारे में भी मैं कहना चाहता हूं। अभी उधर के एक दो साथियों ने, राणे साहब ने किसानों की बात रखी। जैसे खाद्यान्न के बारे में है, उसी प्रकार कपास के बारे में भी स्थिति यह है कि उन को आज इन्सेन्टिव नहीं मिलता। इन्सेन्टिव इसलिये नहीं है कि रेम्युनरेटिव प्राइस उन को नहीं मिलती, वाजिब कीमत नहीं मिलती। इसलिये रूई पैदा करने की जो उनकी क्षमता होनी चाहिये वह घटती जा रही है और रुई पैदा करने का एरिया भी घटता जा रहा है। इसलिए मेरी मांग है कि जिस तरह से बहुत से कारपोरेशंस हम ने बना रखे हैं, एक और उस में इज़ाफा किया जाय और काटन कारपोरेशन बनाया जाय। उस में कामर्स मंत्रालय और खाद्य मंत्रालय मिल कर इस बात की कोशिश करें कि रूई का उत्पादन ज्यादा से ज्यादा हो। इसी के साथ साथ कीमत का मसला भी उसी में तय हो। उस में काटन ग्रोअर्स, मिल मालिक और सरकार के नुमाइन्दे बैठकर उसकी भी कीमत तय करें और काटन के उत्पादन का भी ज्यादा से ज्यादा तरीका निकाला जाय। इस तरह से रूई ज्यादा पैदा होगी। तो मिलों में भी जो दिक्कत है जिसकी चर्चा की गई कि मिलें इसलिए बन्द होना चाहती हैं कि रुई नहीं है, मेरे बहुत से साथियों ने बहुत सी बातें कहीं कि मिलों के पास स्टाक बहुत काफ़ी जमा है और वह धोखा देते हैं, यही नहीं, मेरे इल्म में तो यह आया है कपड़े का भी स्टाक बहुत काफी उन के पास है और उन्होंने अपने होलसेल स्टाकिस्ट्स को कह रखा है कि कपड़ा रोक कर निकाला जाय या जब उनकी तरफ से इन्स्ट्रक्शन आयें तब निकाला जाये, इस तरह से मैं समझता हूं कि कपड़े का बहुत बड़ा स्टाक मिलों के पास और उनके होलसेल स्टाकिस्ट्स के पास है। उस का खमियाजा भुगतना पड़ रहा है उपभोक्ता को। कल मंत्री जी ने एलान किया है राज्य सभा में कि कपड़े की कीमत भी बढ़ने जा रही है। यह एक और भारी बोझ कन्ज्यूमर पर होगा। इस तरह से वह मिल मालिकों को भी सहूलियत दे रहे हैं कि कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन जो है उसके आधार पर कपड़े की कीमत बढ़नी चाहिये और दूसरी तरफ़ मजदूरों को भी कह रहे

[श्री मोहन स्वरूप]

है कि 80 प्रतिशत वह जो ब्लोअर होगा वह उसको मिलेगा लेकिन किसान को केवल 5 प्रतिशत देना चाहते है। तो मेरा सुझाव है कि किसान की तरफ भी ध्यान जाना चाहिये और जब तक कि काटन ग्रोअर अधिक से अधिक तादाद में काटन नहीं पैदा करेगा तब तक यह जो समस्या है इसका समाधान नहीं हो सकेगा। इस लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि जहां आज मजदूर की बात सोची जाती है, जहां मिल मालिक की बात सोची जाती है, वहां किसान की बात भी सोचनी चाहिये ताकि उस को भी सही दाम मिले, उचित दाम मिले और उसके लिये काटन बोने का अधिक से अधिक चाव पैदा हो। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूं।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, अभी माननीय सदस्य श्री मोहन स्वरूप ने भी जिक्र किया . . . . .

Shri Umanath: The hon. Minister started the Bill with a speech in English but now he has switched over to Hindi.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : सभापति महोदय, मुझे पांच मिनट दीजिए । मुझे टाइम नहीं मिलेगा ? . . . .

श्री दिनेश सिंह : रूई के वितरण के बारे में निगम का एक सुझाव उन्होंने रखा। जितनी खाद्यान्न सम्बन्धी वस्तुएं हैं उन के वितरण के बारे में कोई निगम बने कोई ऐसी चीज हो तो एक बहुत अच्छी चीज होगी। लेकिन उसमें बड़ी कठिनाइयां आ जाती हैं और उन की वजह से देखना पड़ता है कि एक काम को करने से बजाया अच्छा होने के और एक बहुत मुश्किलात का सामना करना पड़े तो वह ठीक नहीं होता। लेकिन यह सब सुझाव हमेशा सरकार के सामने आते रहते हैं और इस पर विचार होता रहता है। जब भी ऐसी मांग आयेगी और इस की आवश्यकता समझी जायगी तो इस पर ध्यान दिया जायगा।

माननीय सदस्य श्री मधु लिमये जी ने कई बातों का जिक्र किया था। उन के जो जो सुझाव हैं उनपर हम जरूर विचार करेंगे। कई सवालात भी उन्होंने पूछे थे। लेकिन इतनी जल्दी में थे कि मालूम होता है कि वह चाहते थे कि सिर्फ लिख जाय और वह उस को कह दें, कह कर चले गए, तो उन का जवाब देने में भी कोई खास फायदा मैं नहीं समझता हूं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अनिवार्य भी भी नहीं है।

Shri Dinesh Singh: Shri Umanath wanted me to reply in English so that he could straight away understand it. So, I shall certainly reply to his points in English. He mentioned that cloth production had been going down He quoted various figures from *The Eastern Economist* in this connection. I did not know that he had become so fond of the *The Eastern Economist.*

Shri Umanath: Only for facts.

Shri Dinesh Singh: He could have got his figures as easily from the *Indian Statistics of Cotton Production.*

Shri Umanath: The figures regardin g spindlage are from the Government statistics. Only for the cotton price, I quoted from *The Eastern Economist.*

Shri Dinesh Singh: From the production figures that I have here, it does not appear that the production has fallen.

Shri Umanath: I challenge him on the figures. I quoted only the Government figures.

Shri Dinesh Singh: The hon. Member must have seen some other column.

Shri Umanath: I quoted from public documents. I am prepared to challenge him on the figures.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am quoting from the *Indian Textile Bulletin (January, 1966, vol. 12, No. 10)*, page 69. This gives the mill production of cotton. It has been going up. For the hon. Members' benefit, if he so wishes, I shall read out the figures. It has varied from year to year. In 1962, the figure as mentioned here was 380; in 1963, it went down to 368; in 1964 it went up to 387; in 1965 it was 382. So, he cannot say...

Shri Umanath: Let him give the figure for 1966 also.

Shri Dinesh Singh: For 1966 the figure is only for the period from January to November; the figure for the other months is not here. Probably, the hon. Member had missed that part.

Shri Umanath: Is it cloth production? Is he quoting the figures of cloth production?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am giving the figures of cloth production from this.

So, he will see that the figures that I have quoted were not wrong. Also, the spindleage and its utilisation has been going up. I can read out the figures in this connection also, if he so desires.

He also mentioned some figures about requisitioning also, I guess, from *The Eastern Economist*, which I am afraid are equally wrong. The figures that I have are that the requisitioning in January, 1967 was of the order of 8000 bales, in February it was 4,000 bales and recently since we stepped it up in March, we requisitinoned 20,000 bales.

Shri Umanath: It includes the frozen stock at Bombay port?

Shri Dinesh Singh: Requisitioned stock.

I would beg of him to bear in mind that we are endeavouring in every possible way to requisition cotton that we can get and to make sure that the mills do not stop beyond the permissible time had that we shall make every effort to do so because it is something which has to be done.

Shri S. M. Banerjee talked about the Lakshmiratan Cotton Mills. I had already talked to him about it earlier and I do not think it was necessary for him to mention that we were not doing anything in it because Shri Ram Ratan Gupta or somebody else had given any money to the Congress Party. I have not raised any money for the Congress Party.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: He has not done it. Shri Manubhai Shah's brother and Shri Sampurnand's brother —they are still working there. I can give the names.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I want to assure him that I shall not be under any of the pressures he has mentioned. I mentioned to him that if the Government of UP were willing to appoint a Controller to take it over, we shall very gladly cooperate with them. I had also told him that if that Government were not willing to do so and if there was something that we could do, we shall examine it, and if it is at all possible in the sense that it is really causing hardship and the financial aspect was all right, we shall certainly take it over to avoid any hardship.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Let him send his own officers.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I am in the process of having that matter examined. I can assure him that I shall give it my sympathetic consideration.

He also talked about our taking over the mills and setting up a corporation. I did say in the body of my speech moving for consideration that

[Shri Dinesh Singh]

we are contemplating to doing exactly the same thing. In fact, if I may say so, we said it on our own without his having to refer to it. That is our own intention. Of course, the legal and other aspects have to be examined before I make a commitment. I only expressed my desire to do so.

He also mentioned about cotton being in stock in excess. If he or any other member would kindly give me any information, I shall see that those stocks are immediately requisitioned.

Shri Umanath: What is his machinery doing?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I gave the figures earlier. The machinery has stepped up requsitioning and it is our intention to step it up further if necessary so that this cotton is unearthed.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You promise to arrest Shri Ram Ratan Gupta. Then you will see the cotton stock which has been hidden.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Shri Gupta talked about lay-off compensation and rise in price of cloth. I would like to assure the House that it is not our intention to increase the price of cloth beyond what is more or less obligatory. There are certain factors in the multiplier and if they go up, we have to give sympathetic consideration. We shall endeavour to see that the least hardship is placed on the consumer and as such, any rise that we may permit will be the absolute minimum. I can assure the House that we would not like to place any extra burden on the consumer.

So far as the lay-off compensation is concerned, I think Shri N. C. Chatterjee raised the question of its legality. I am informed that this is perfectly in orer. In fact, we have taken it from the Industrial Disputes Atc of 1947 which has provided for lay-off compensation. They have no talked of badli workers there. We have included badli workers in this. If I may say so, it is an improvement.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have congratulated him on that.

Shri Dinesh Singh: Reference was made about the need for the extension of this legislation to the States of Jammu and Kashmir. We have no hesitation in doing so except that the original Act which we are endeavouring to amend today does not extend to that State. So that will have to be by a separate amendment. But the Government of Jammu and Kashmir have been approached and I expect full co-operation from them in this respect. Some hon. Members have referred to the hardship that is being experienced by the gowers, and I can assure them that we have every sympathy and consideration for them. In fact, it was only in December that we increased the ceiling price of cotton.

Shri Umanath: That goes to the speculator only, it does not go to the grower. That does not help them.

Shri Dinesh Singh: So far as the floor price is concerned, if the hon. Member is referring to that, we shall certainly examine whether there is any need to raise it, because at the moment prices, as has been pointed out, are ruling over the ceiling, and as such there should be no difficulty in selling cotton, but if there is any difficulty that the producers are experiencing we shall certainly go into it.

Hon. Member, Mr. Somani has also gone away after making his first speech in the House. I believe he had put the industry's point of view which is well known. He talked about export.

I wish the industry would endeavour to export textiles. In fact, their export today is just over 10 per cent. If they are genuinely willing to step up their export, I am willing to sit down with them and consider what assistance they require, but they have this tremendous internal consumers' market, and therefore I do not think that they are putting in the effort that they should really put in for export.

So far as industry is concerned, he blamed that we had prevented its modernisation. In fact, the industry itself has not made efforts to modernise. While new spindleage has been added, new units have been added, they have not goine in so much for transformation. We cannot allow large numbers of workers to be thrown out of employment by their trying to close down. Instead of going in for new mills, they can easily go in for improvement of existing mills so that workers will find employment and the mills themselves will be renovated. I think it is a thing which the industry needs to consider, and as I have said, the Government will consider it.

I hope I shall have the co-operation of the House in getting this amendment through, and also in maintaining efforts in bringing about a reasonable distribution of cotton and also textiles.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: No co-operation in the matter of closure.

Shri Senavane: Will the hon. Minister look into them if the problems and difficulties of textile mills in Sholapur District are brought to his notice?

Shri Dinesh Singh: I will look into them.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbani): The hon. Minster was pleased to state that the extension of this Act to Jammu and Kashmir will entail an amendment of the original Act. I may point out that by a mere Presidential order it can be done.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानकरी चाहता हूं कि हमारे देश में रुई के उत्पादन के बारे में जो सुझाव दिया गया था कि सरकार उस को अधिक प्रोत्साहन देने के लिये काश्तकारों की सहायता करे उस के बारे में क्या सरकार विचार करेगी।

इस के साथ साथ आप ने देखा होगा और सरकार को स्वयंम् अनुभव होगा कि सीजन के समय में जब काश्तकार के घर से रुई आती है तो कपास की एक गांठ का भाव 175 रु० क्विन्टल खुलता है, लेकिन जब माल मार्केट में आता है तो वह 140 रु० पर खरीदा गया। यह जो भेद-भाव किया गया और भावों में जो इतना बड़ा गैप है उत्पादनकर्ता और खरीदने वाले के, उस को क्या समाप्त किया जायेगा ?

अन्त में मेरा सुझाव है मिल मालिकों की जो हालत है उस के बारे में। रुई की कमी की वजह से, उत्पादन में कमी की वजह से, पैसा न होने से जब मिलें बन्द हो जाती हैं, उन के बारे में एक आदमी सरकार का, एक आदमी मजदूर का और एक आदमी मालिकों का, इन तीनों को मिला कर एक कमेटी बनायें और उन को पैसा दे कर मिल चलती रहें इस का प्रयास करें।

श्री दिनेश सिंह : सभापति महोदय, इस के ऊपर हम विचार करेंगे और ऐग्रीकल्चर मिनिस्ट्री भी इस के बारे में सोच रही है। पहली बात तो यह कि जो रुई पैदा होती है उस के ऊपर अब कंट्रोल नहीं है। इस से लोगों को प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा। दूसरी बात यह कि अब की मर्तबा हम ऐसा भी सोच रहे हैं कि जो रुपया ऐडवान्स जो किया जाता है रुई के लिये उसको कम किया जाये जिस से जो लोग रुई रखते हैं वह न रख सकें।

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, and to continue for a further

[Mr. Chairman]

period the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Act, 1964, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put clause 2 to vote.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Alipore): I have tabled some amendments.

Mr. Chairman: The time is already half past six. All right. You may move them.

Clauses 2 and 3

Shri Indrajit Gupta: I move my amendments Nos. 1, 2, 7 and 10

Page 2, line 4,—

for "for, any reason," *substitute*—

"the Central Government is satisfied that"

Page 2, lines 28 and 29,—

omit "fifty per cent. of" (2)

Page 2, line 21,—

for "more" *substitute* "less" (7)

Page, 3—

for lines 11 and 12 *substitute*—

"undertaking which shall be equal to the total of the basic wages and dearness allowance that would have been payable to such persons had there been no such closure". (10)

Shri K. Ramani (Coimbatore): I move my amendments Nos. 3, 4 and 5.

Page 2,—

omit lines 20 to 22 (3)

Page 2, lines 28 and 29,—

omit "fifty per cent. of" (4)

Page 3,—

for lines 11 and 12 *substitute*—

"undertaking which shall be equal to the total of basic wages and dearness allowance that would have been payable to such persons had there been no such closure" (5)

Shri Umanath: I move my amendments Nos. 12 and 13.

Page 2, line 17,—

after "wholly" *insert*—

"or render any machine idle" (12)

Page 2,

after line 22, *insert*—

"(c) no person shall indulge in forward trading, direct or benami, in such commodities referred to in sub-section (4A)." (13)

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs said this morning that it was essential to pass this Bill and that this was going to the Rajya Sabha this evening. The Rajya Sabha has adjourned at 5 O'clock So, some more time may be allowed for us to discuss the amendments.

Mr. Chairman: This evening perhaps means the next sitting.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put all the amendments to clause 2.

The Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7; 12 & 13 *were put and negatived.*

Mr. Chairman: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put the amendments to clause 3 to the vote.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 10 were also put and negatived

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put clause 3 to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: I shall now put clause 5 to the vote of the Bill.

Shri Umanath: Sir, we protest against this procedure. We are not allowed to discuss or speak on our amendments. This affects millions of people. Rajya Sabha is not sitting now. There is no harm if 15-20 more minutes are allowed.

Mr. Chairman: There was not a single dissenting voice when the time-limit was fixed in the morning. It was fixed by the House.

Shri Umanath: No, no. He wanted four hours; and I said that at least three hours should be given. Now that the Rajya Sabha is not sitting, it is unfair to adopt this procedure.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : अभी कुछ नहीं हुआ है। अगर दो घंटे ठहरायें जाते हैं तो एक घंटा और बढ़ा दिया जाता है। तीन हो जाते हैं। यह दो घंटे चल चुका है, एक घंटा संशोधन पर चर्चा हो सकती है।

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, I rise on a point of order, under rule 376(2), a point of order may be raised in relation to the business before the House at the moment. The business before the House at the moment is the Essential Commodities Bill. The first reading has gone through; the second reading has been reached; the third reading remains. During the second reading, on certain clauses, there were many important amendments. One of the amendments tabled by Shri Indrajit Gupta was to the effect that there should be full payment made to the workers. We are dealing with the question of workers; they have elected us to this House. (*Interruption*). We were told that only two hours have been fixed. (*Interruption*). Please try to understand something.

Shri Sheo Narain (Basti): We are understanding.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Kindly hear me, Sir. This is an extraordinary situation where even important amendments like the one moved by Shri Indrajit Gupta that full compensation should be paid, or like the one moved by Shri Umanath are passed over without being discussed. We are not allowed to even move those amendments. What is this steam-rolling? I do not understand.

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry. In this very House, during the past few days, I myself witnessed amendments being thrown out or passed in bulk. At that time, the hon. Members did not take any objection.

Shri Umanath: After discussion of the amendments, they were put to vote in bulk; here, there was no discussion at all.

Mr. Chairman: They were discussed along with the main motion.

Shri Umanath: In the case of amendments to a resolution, they are combined and put in bulk. But here, in the case of this Bill, no discussion has been allowed in respect of the amendments which we have moved. In the case of the resolutions, the amendments are combined and put to vote. But here is a Bill, which has reached the clause-by-clause consideration stage, and so there must be a discussion of the amendments.

Mr. Chairman: I quite agree. On the one hand, the House has already fixed the time-limit; this is the last day of the session.

Shri Umanath: The sitting can be extended.

Mr. Chairman: We have to start the half-hour discussion which is to begin at 6.30. It is already half past six.

श्री हुकम चंद कछवाय : हम लोग बठने के लिये तैयार हैं। आप समय क्यों नहीं बढ़ाते।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. One at a time.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: With all respect to you, I may say that it was in your discretion to see that time was given for the amendments; but then even within the time-limit fixed, which was up to 6.30, the general discussion on the Bill should have been curtailed. so that enough time may be left for moving the amendments. You permitted them to go on, and the Minister by the time he had finalised the reply—it was 6.30—and there were two minutes remaining. But then you wanted to guillotine the amendments and finish the Bill.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry my courtesy and accommodation shown to them is recoiling on me. I had accommodated the maximum number of oposition Members within the time fixed.

Shri Umanath: In view of the fact that your are not supporting the request for extension of time to discuss the amendments. I am walking out.

श्री मधु लिमये एक घंटा समय बढ़ा दीजिये।

Mr. Chairman: I am now putting clause 5 to the vote of the House.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: We walk out in protest.

Shri Umanth: We walk out.

(Shri S. M. Banerjee, Shri Umanath, Shri Indrajit Gupta and some other hon. Members then left the House).

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry; it is not fair. The question is:

"That clause 5 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1. the Enacting Formula and the Title ware then added to the Bill.

Shri Dinesh Singh: I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Chairman: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

Now, the question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Chairman: I am very sorry that some hon. Members left the House. I gave the maximum time to the Opposition. Now, the House will take up the half-an-hour discussion. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

Shri Shoe Narain: There is no quorum in the House.

Shri Inderjit Malhotra (Jammu): Sir, on a point of order. There is no quorum in the House.

The Minister of Law (Shri Govinda Menon): I would like to make an appeal to Mr. Prakash Vir Shastri about the elections in Jammu and Kashmir. There are 6 writ petitions pending in the High Court of Jammu and Kashmir. There are 25 election petitions pending before the election tribunal about Assembly elections. There are four election petitions pending in the High Court about Parliament elections. In these circumstances, since the matters which are proposed to be raised....

Shri Sheo Narain: On a point on order, Sir There is no quorum.

Mr. Chairman: The bell is being rung.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) जानबूझ कर षड्यंत्र रचा गया है।

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry I have given enough time for the members to assemble, but in spite of that the number is less than the requisite number. There is no other alternative but to adjourn the House *sine die.*

18.44 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned sine die.